



A University of Sussex DPhil thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

PORTRAIT SETS IN TUDOR AND JACOBEOAN ENGLAND

Two Volumes
(Volume One)

Catherine Daunt

Thesis submitted for the degree of DPhil at the University of Sussex

May 2015

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has not been and will not be, submitted in whole or in part to another university for the award of any other degree.

Catherine Daunt

CONTENTS

Volume One

Acknowledgements	x
Summary	xi
List of Abbreviations	xii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Origins of Portrait Sets in England	5
The Crown's Use of Portraiture Under Henry VII	6
The Influence of Henry VIII's Collections	13
An Emerging Market for Historical Royal Portraits	17
The Earliest Evidence for Sets in Aristocratic Collections	19
A Bishop's Set of Heroes and Heroines	27
Mid-Century Sets of Protestant Reformers	28
An Early Set of Benefactors	31
Conclusions	33
Chapter 2: Continental Influences on English Painted Sets	34
<i>Uomini Famosi</i>	35
Channels of Influence	38
The Intellectual Context: Humanism	39
Numerical Series and Moralizing Imagery	42
Sibyls and Prophets	43
Roman Emperors	47
Prints and Effigy Books	49
Conclusions	53
Chapter 3: History, Antiquarianism and Genealogy	55
A New History for England	55
Antiquarianism	56
The Search for Authentic Likenesses	57
The Use of Portrait Sets to Denote Antiquity	65
i. Family Histories	65
ii. Portraits of Local Heroes in a Domestic Setting	69
iii. Royal Portrait Sets in a Domestic Setting	70
iv. Civic and Institutional Histories	75
v. Royal Sets in Civic Institutions	77
vi. The History of an Office or Profession	80
Conclusions	86
Chapter 4: Elizabethan and Jacobean Royal Sets	88
The Royal Sets:	90
Theobalds, Hertfordshire (1580s?)	90
The Lumley Collection (before 1590)	95
Ripon Deanery, North Yorkshire (c.1585-1600)	97

Longleat House, Wiltshire (c.1585-1600)	101
Syon House, Middlesex (c.1590s)	104
Weston, Warwickshire (c.1589-95)	107
Hardwick New Hall, Derbyshire (before 1601)	112
The 'Cornwallis' Set, The Royal Collection, London (c.1590-1610)	116
The 'Hornby' Set, National Portrait Gallery, London (1597-1618)	118
Robert Hare's Gallery, London (before 1611)	123
The Dulwich Set (1618-20)	124
Hever Castle, Kent (after 1618)	130
Possible Lost Sets	130
Conclusions	131
Chapter 5: Galleries of Fame, 1590s-1625	133
<i>The Weston Set</i>	134
The Sitters	134
The Portrait Sources	136
Location and Display	137
Sheldon's 'Goodly Shew'	140
<i>The Knole Set</i>	141
Historiography	142
The Sitters	144
Later Additions	147
The Availability of Sources	150
The Date of the Set	153
Location and Display	155
Attribution	160
A Reading of the Set	161
Conclusions	165
Conclusion	167
Bibliography	175

Volume Two

Methodological Preface	1
Appendices	
Appendix 1: English Royal Sets - A Catalogue of Extant Paintings	6
i. The Royal Collection, 1504-30	6
ii. Hatfield House, Hertfordshire (Marquess of Salisbury), c.1580s	10
iii. Floriated Spandrel Set, c.1580s (various collections)	13
iv. The Dean and Chapter of Ripon Cathedral, North Yorkshire, c.1585-1600	15
v. Longleat, Wiltshire (Marquess of Bath), c.1585-1600	24
vi. Syon House, Middlesex (Duke of Northumberland), c.1590s	28

vii.	Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire (National Trust), before 1601	33
viii.	The ‘Cornwallis’ Set, The Royal Collection (c.1590-1610)	38
ix.	The ‘Hornby Set’, National Portrait Gallery, London, c.1597-1618	46
x.	Dulwich Picture Gallery, London, 1618-20	55
xi.	Hever Castle, Kent, after 1618	64
Appendix 2: English Royal Portraits – Known Versions		66
	William I	67
	William II	68
	Henry I	69
	Stephen	70
	Henry II	71
	Richard I	72
	John	73
	Henry III	74
	Edward I	75
	Edward III	76
	Edward, The Black Prince	78
	Richard II	79
	Henry IV	81
	Henry V	86
	Henry VI	89
	Edward IV	93
	Elizabeth Woodville	96
	Edward V	98
	Richard III	99
	Margaret Beaufort	103
	Henry VII	105
	Elizabeth of York	110
	Prince Arthur	112
	Henry VIII	113
	Katherine of Aragon	116
	Anne Boleyn	118
	Jane Seymour	120
	Edward VI	122
	Mary I	126
Appendix 3: Heroines of Antiquity from Amberley Castle, West Sussex, c.1526		129
Appendix 4: A Set of Benefactors at Peterhouse College, Cambridge, c.1565-1617		134
Appendix 5: Edward Alleyn’s Set of Sibyls, 1620		139
Appendix 6: Printed Series of English Kings and Queens		144
i.	John Rastell, <i>The pastyme of people</i> (1529/30)	144
ii.	Gyles Godet, <i>A brief abstract of the genealogie of all the kynges of England</i> (c.1560-62)	149
iii.	Hendrik Goltzius, <i>The kings and queens of England</i> (1584-85)	154

iv.	Thomas Talbot, <i>Talbot's Rose</i> (1589)	158
v.	T.T., <i>A booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England</i> (1597)	160
vi.	John Speed, <i>Theatre of the Empire of Great Britaine</i> (Lancashire) (1611/12)	174
vii.	Walter Dight, <i>The True and Lively Purtractures of the Kinges of England</i> (c.1610-12)	177
viii.	John Taylor, <i>A Briefe Remembrance of all the English Monarchs</i> (1618)	182
ix.	Henry Holland, <i>Baziliologia</i> (1618)	188
x.	John Taylor, <i>Briefe Remembrance of all the English Monarchs</i> (1622)	198
Appendix 7: The Norman Earls of Chester, 1578		204
Appendix 8: Gloucester Benefactors, c.1600-18		209
Appendix 9: The Constables of Queenborough Castle, Kent, 1597-1603		216
Appendix 10: The Weston Set, c.1589-95		223
Appendix 11: The Knole Set, c.1608		236

Tables

Table 1: Dendrochronology – Early Pictures in the Royal Collection
Table 2: Dendrochronology – Comparative Royal Portraits, 1500-1550
Table 3: Dendrochronology – Comparative Royal Portraits, 1550-1600
Table 4: Dendrochronology – The ‘Hornby’ Set (NPG), 1597-1618
Table 5: Portrait Sets of English Royal Figures
Table 6: Dendrochronology – The Weston Set
Table 7: English Royal Portraits at Hardwick New Hall, 1601
Table 8: Knole Sitter Comparison
Table 9: Knole Sitters (Order)

Illustrations

1. Paintings of Henry VI's son Prince Edward, Edward IV, Edward V and Henry VII at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, 1475
2. Portrait of Edward IV by an unknown artist, c.1510, Society of Antiquaries, London
3. Portrait of Richard III by an unknown artist, c.1510, Society of Antiquaries, London
4. Portrait of Edward IV by an unknown artist, 1530s, Society of Antiquaries, London
5. Portrait of Henry VI by an unknown artist, c.1530s, Society of Antiquaries, London

6. Portrait of Henry VI by an unknown artist, c.1540, National Portrait Gallery, London
7. Portrait of Edward IV by an unknown artist, c.1540, National Portrait Gallery, London
8. Portrait of Henry VI by an unknown artist, c.1540, Government Art Collection, London
9. Portrait of Edward IV by an unknown artist, c.1540, Government Art Collection, London
10. Portrait of Pietro Vermigli by an unknown artist, c.1560, National Portrait Gallery, London
11. The Great Chamber, Chastleton House, Oxfordshire
12. Painting of the Cumaean Sibyl, c.1610-12, Chastleton House, Oxfordshire
13. Painting of the Erythraean Sibyl, c.1610-12, Chastleton House, Oxfordshire
14. Engraved portrait of Henry VII by Jodocus Hondius, detail from *Talbot's Rose*, 1589
15. Woodcut portrait of Henry VII from T.T., *A booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England* (London: John de Beauchesne, 1597)
16. Portraits of Henry III, Edward I, Edward II and Edward II, engraving by Hendrik Goltzius, 1584-85
17. Portraits of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I and Elizabeth I, engraving by Hendrick Goltzius, 1584-85
18. Detail of Edward III's gilt copper tomb effigy at Westminster Abbey, London, 1386
19. Woodcut portrait of Edward III from T.T., *A booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England* (London: John de Beauchesne, 1597)
20. Detail of Henry III's gilt copper tomb effigy at Westminster Abbey, London, 1291-93
21. Portrait possibly representing Henry III by an unknown artist, c.1597-1618, National Portrait Gallery, London
22. Detail from Hendrik Goltzius, *The kings and queens of England*, 1584-85, sheet 4, showing the head of Henry III
23. Detail of the inscription on the top left of the portrait possibly representing Henry III, National Portrait Gallery, London
24. Details of the inscriptions on the portraits of Henry I and John in the Hornby Castle set of kings and queens, National Portrait Gallery, London
25. Portrait of Richard II by an unknown artist, 1394-95, Westminster Abbey, London
26. Detail of Richard II's gilt copper tomb effigy at Westminster Abbey, London, 1394-96
27. Engraved portrait of Charles VI of France from *Cronica breve de i fatti illustri de Re di Francia* (Venice: Bernardo Giunti, 1588)
28. Detail of Henry IV's marble tomb effigy (with Queen Joan) in Canterbury Cathedral, Kent, c.1410-20
29. Portrait of Henry VI(?) attributed to Sampson Strong, 1607, Christ's Hospital, Abingdon
30. Portrait of Edward VI attributed to Sampson Strong, 1607, Christ's Hospital, Abingdon

31. *Figure Byrsa Londinensis vulgo the Royal Exchange* by Wenceslaus Hollar (1607-1677), interior view of the Royal Exchange, London, c.1647, etching
32. *The Royal Exchange* by Frans Hogenberg (1539/40-1590), interior view of the Royal Exchange, London, c.1569, engraving
33. Upper end of the Old Dining Room at Weston, Warwickshire. Engraving published in Henry Shaw, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture* (London: William Pickering, 1839)
34. The Old Drawing Room, Knebworth, 1906
35. Detail of the inscription on a portrait of Thomas Wolsey, National Portrait Gallery, London
36. The Brown Gallery, Knole, Kent
37. Detail of the frame (recto, bottom left) on the portrait of Mary I from the Knole set
38. Detail of the frame (recto, bottom left) on the portrait of John Fisher from the Knole set
39. Verso of the Elizabeth I panel from the Knole set
40. Top of the John Wyclif panel from the Knole set
41. Top edge of the Earl of Nottingham frame and panel from the Knole set
42. Detail of the Earl of Nottingham portrait from the Knole set in infra-red light
43. Portrait of James Wilford by an unknown artist, c.1575, Coughton Court, Warwickshire
44. Detail of the portrait of Thomas Wolsey from the Knole set in infra-red light
45. Portrait of Thomas Wolsey by Magdalena de Passe or Willem de Passe, line engraving, published 1620
46. Portrait of John Fisher by Hans Holbein the Younger, black and coloured chalks, brown wash, pen and ink, brush and ink on pale pink prepared paper, c.1532-34, Royal Collection, London
47. Portrait of John Fisher by Philips Galle, line engraving from *Virorum Doctorum de Disciplinis Effigies XLIII* (Antwerp, 1572)
48. South-east corner of the Cartoon Gallery, Knole
49. East return of the south bay of the Cartoon Gallery
50. Detail of the cornice in the south-east corner of the Cartoon Gallery
51. Detail of the stencil design on the cornice in the south-east corner of the Cartoon Gallery
52. Flower painting on the south-east wall of the Cartoon Gallery
53. Detail of flower paintings on the south wall of the Cartoon Gallery
54. Verso of John Fisher panel from the Knole set
55. Detail of one of the nail holes on the verso of the Earl of Essex panel from the Knole set
56. Detail of nail holes on the verso of the John Norris panel from the Knole set
57. Holes in the frieze on the south-east wall of the Cartoon Gallery
58. Photomicrograph of the frame on the portrait of John of Austria from the Knole set
59. Photomicrograph of the bottom right spandrel of the John of Austria painting from the Knole set
60. Portrait of John Wyclif by George White, mezzotint, 1710-35
61. Portrait of John Wyclif by Richard Godfrey, engraving, 1781
62. Portrait of Friar Bacon by Richard Godfrey, stipple engraving, 1786
63. Portrait of Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd Earl of Sussex by Richard Godfrey, line engraving, 1788

64. Portrait of John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland by Richard Godfrey, line engraving, 1786
65. Detail of the blue paint in the upper spandrels of the Wyclif portrait from the Knoles set
66. Detail of the blue paint in the top left spandrel of the Wyclif portrait from the Knoles set
67. Photomicrograph of the bottom right spandrel of the Burghley portrait from the Knoles set
68. Cross section of a paint sample taken from the bottom left spandrel on the portrait of the Earl of Sussex from the Knoles set
69. Highly magnified photomicrograph of the bottom left spandrel of the Sussex portrait from the Knoles set
70. Term from the frieze on the south wall of the Cartoon Gallery
71. Term from the frieze on the south wall of the Cartoon Gallery
72. Cornice label on the east wall of the Cartoon Gallery

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the professional and personal support of many people. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Professor Maurice Howard, whose guidance has been invaluable and with whom it has been a privilege to work. Special thanks must also go to the Leverhulme Trust who have funded my research as part as the National Portrait Gallery's 'Making Art in Tudor Britain' research project. I am grateful to many people at the NPG but firstly I must thank Tarnya Cooper, without whose encouragement I would not have embarked on this challenge. The professional expertise of my other colleagues on the 'Making Art in Tudor Britain' research team has been a constant source of inspiration and they have all been an absolute pleasure to work with. They include Charlotte Bolland, Aviva Burnstock, Sally Marriott, Sophie Plender, Polly Saltmarsh, Caroline Rae and Edward Town. I am especially grateful to Ed and Caroline who have both made excellent travel companions on a number of trips and have always been willing to discuss ideas and share their thoughts. Other colleagues at the National Portrait Gallery whose support has been gratefully received include Jane Eade, Catharine MacLeod, Richard Hallas, Jacob Simon, Carol Blackett-Ord, Bryony Millan, Elizabeth Heath and Joseph Ripp. I am also indebted to Ian Tyers who, with Edward Town, spent many cold hours with me at Knole and who has always been so generous with his time and expertise. Other scholars to whom I am grateful include Robert Tittler, Frederick Hepburn, Hilary Turner, Jennifer Scott, Karen Coke, Simon Healy, Claire Gapper and Emily Cole.

During the course of this research I have been fortunate enough to view many paintings, some of which are not normally on display to the public, and there are numerous people who have made this possible. I could not have completed my research at Knole without the generosity of Robert Sackville-West and his family, and the support of the all the National Trust staff there, primarily Siobhan Barratt, Helen Fawbert, Emma Slocombe and Emily Watts, who have all been wonderful. At Hatfield, I must thank the Marquess of Salisbury for generously allowing me access and Robin Harcourt-Williams and Vicki Perry for their help. At Ripon I received a very warm welcome from the Very Reverend Keith Jukes who had now sadly passed away, but I would like to thank his secretary Judith Bustard as well as Ian Horsford and Gail Squires. Other owners who have allowed me into their private homes include Lord Stafford and Nicholas Fothergill, for which I am very grateful. There are also many curators, archivist and librarians who have facilitated my research and those who deserve a special mention include Kate Harris at Longleat, Clare Fleck at Knebworth, Henrietta Ryan at Eton, Karin Kyburz at the Witt Library, Jerome Farrell at the Leathersellers' Company and Rebecca Hughes and John Martin Robinson at Arundel Castle. I would also like to thank Régine Page at the Hamilton Kerr Institute, Cambridge and paintings conservator Alan Bradford.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends who have encouraged and supported me despite my lack of sociability during the course of this project. I am especially grateful to my husband Tom Blyth and my parents, Sally and Nicholas Daunt.

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

Catherine Daunt

The degree of DPhil, May 2015

Portrait Sets in Tudor and Jacobean EnglandSUMMARY

This thesis examines the taste for sets of easel portraits in England during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI and I. Looking primarily at sets of historical figures, particularly English kings and queens, the thesis aims to assess the extent of the fashion and identify the audience for such sets. The material qualities of the paintings are discussed and the methods of production, as well as the function and meaning of specific sets.

The first chapter examines the evidence for the earliest portrait sets of this type in England and suggests that innovations in art and architecture at Court had a significant influence on the development of the genre. The earliest evidence for portrait sets in aristocratic collections is examined and specific examples of early known sets are discussed.

The second and third chapters look at the intellectual context in which the fashion for portrait sets emerged. It is suggested that humanist ideas about the display of portraiture and related artistic trends on the continent contributed to the emerging demand for this type of painting in England. It is argued that the widespread interest in history, genealogy and antiquarianism at this time led to a demand for images of historical figures. In addition, it is suggested that portrait sets were often used to communicate messages of legitimacy and authority by implying that a family or institution had an illustrious and lengthy lineage.

The final two chapters discuss known portrait sets in detail and include case studies of specific sets. The fourth chapter focuses on sets of English kings and queens and the fifth chapter on sets of illustrious figures drawn from various categories of famous men and women. The latter includes case studies of a set formerly at Weston, Warwickshire and a set at Knole, Kent.

Abbreviations

<i>BL</i>	British Library, London
<i>BM</i>	British Museum, London
<i>CUP</i>	Cambridge University Press
<i>DPG</i>	Dulwich Picture Gallery, London
<i>GAC</i>	Government Art Collection, London
<i>GL</i>	Guildhall Library, London
<i>HAL</i>	Heinz Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, London
<i>HPO</i>	History of Parliament Online
<i>HMSO</i>	His Majesty's Stationary Office
<i>KHLC</i>	Kent History and Library Centre, Maidstone
<i>LDSAL</i>	Society of Antiquaries, London inventory number
<i>MATB</i>	'Making Art in Tudor Britain research project', National Portrait Gallery (2007-14)
<i>NAL</i>	National Art Library, Victoria & Albert Museum, London
<i>NPG</i>	National Portrait Gallery, London
<i>NTIN</i>	National Trust Inventory Number
<i>ODNB</i>	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
<i>OUP</i>	Oxford University Press
<i>TNA</i>	The National Archive, London
<i>RCIN</i>	Royal Collection Inventory Number
<i>STC</i>	<i>A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640</i> , compiled by A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave and others, 2 nd edn, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991). All STC references are from this edition.
<i>YUP</i>	Yale University Press

Introduction

Serial representations of kings and queens and other historically significant figures were an established convention in English art before the sixteenth century but it was not until the reign of Elizabeth I that a significant market for sets of easel portraits began to develop.¹ Sets depicting Protestant reformers and institutional benefactors began to appear around the middle decades of the century and small sets of portraits depicting English kings and queens may also have been made for an elite few around this time. It was not until the second half of Elizabeth's reign, however, that more extensive sets of royal figures and illustrious men and women became fashionable among the nobility and the wealthy middle classes. The enthusiasm for portrait sets appears to have been at its height in around the 1590s; the decade saw a significant rise in the number of civic institutions commissioning sets of benefactors and former members, and the majority of the extant sets of kings and queens date from around this time. For the most part, portrait sets depicted historical figures or illustrious contemporaries who had contributed to a recent historical narrative, and the taste for sets was related to a widespread interest in national history that was also reflected in the literature and drama of the time. For example, the fashion for sets developed soon after the publication of the first edition of Raphael Holinshed's hugely successful chronicle history of England, Ireland and Scotland in 1577 and appears to have reached its peak in the decade that William Shakespeare wrote the majority of his English history plays.²

It is my intention in this thesis to assess for the first time how extensive the fashion for sets of portraits was during this period and to examine why it emerged when it did. I will also examine the range of subjects represented in sets, how the paintings were displayed and the motivations of those who acquired them. Although the trend for sets of easel portraits has been generally acknowledged in surveys of British art of this

¹ Throughout this thesis the term 'portrait set' is used to refer to a group of individual easel paintings, either on wood or canvas, which was produced and/ or purchased with the intention that they would be displayed together.

² Raphael Holinshed and others, *The firste [laste] volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande*, 2 vols (London: John Hunne, 1577) [hereafter Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1577)]. Between 1591 and 1599, Shakespeare wrote *Henry VI, Part 2*; *Henry VI, Part 3*; *Henry VI, Part 1*; *Richard III*; *Richard II*; *King John*; *Henry IV, Part 1*; *Henry IV, Part 2*; *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* (Tarnya Cooper, *Searching For Shakespeare* (London: NPG, 2006), pp. 10-11).

period, including important works by Ellis Waterhouse and Eric Mercer, the genre has not been studied in depth.³ Surviving portraits sets are generally composed of what has been termed 'workshop quality' paintings, meaning derivative portrait types that are summarily painted, often in a rather linear style. They are the type of portraits that Richard Haydocke probably had in mind when he decried the quality of English painting in 1598 and complained about the 'lame, disproportioned and unseemelie Counterfeites' of kings and queens and other 'Honourable Personages'.⁴ In addition, very few sets made during these years can be associated with named artists, the majority having been produced by multiple anonymous artists or perhaps even heraldic, decorative or theatrical painters. It is largely as a result of the quality, the derivative nature of the works and the lack of attributions to known artists, that this category of painting has hitherto received little attention from art historians. However, the subject has recently been discussed in relation to civic and provincial portraiture by the historian Robert Tittler, who has written about a number of specific examples that were produced for civic authorities and institutions including Oxford and Cambridge colleges.⁵ Tarnya Cooper has also addressed the subject in her recent work on portraiture and the urban elite.⁶

The taste for sets has been dealt with in more detail in catalogues of specific collections or exhibitions in which the genre is represented. Extant sets have been catalogued, for example, by John Ingamells (for Dulwich Picture Gallery, London) and Oliver Millar (for the Royal Collection, London) and in both cases, some context has been provided.⁷ Roy Strong dealt with the subject of portrait sets in his 1969 catalogue of the NPG's Tudor and Jacobean paintings, which includes a number of portraits that were originally

³ Ellis Waterhouse, *Painting in Britain, 1530 to 1790*, 5th edn (New Haven and London: YUP, 1994), pp. 13-14, 40-41; Eric Mercer, *English Art, 1553-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), pp. 150, 159.

⁴ Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo, *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge carvinge and buildinge*, trans. and ed. by Richard Haydocke (Oxford: Richard Haydocke, 1598), 'To the Reader'.

⁵ Robert Tittler, *The Face of the City: Civic Portraiture and Civic Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007) and *Portraits, Painters and Publics in Provincial England, 1540-1640* (Oxford: OUP, 2012).

⁶ Tarnya Cooper, *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2012), p. 132.

⁷ John Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery: British* (London: Unicorn Press, 2008), pp. 19-31 and 34-38; Oliver Millar in *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London: Phaidon Press, 1963), pp. 27, 49-51, 62, 63, 67.

from sets, and *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture*, published in the same year.⁸ An extant set of English kings and queens in the NPG collection (formerly at Hornby Castle, North Yorkshire) entered the Gallery's collection after Strong's catalogue was published, but the set has been the subject of two articles by Robin Gibson.⁹ Chief among the exhibition catalogues that address the subject are Pamela Tudor-Craig's catalogue for the NPG's exhibition on Richard III in 1973 and the catalogue for an exhibition at Dulwich Picture Gallery in 1994 entitled *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*.¹⁰ Edward Alleyn (1566-1626) purchased a set of kings and queens between 1618 and 1620 and a set of sibyls in 1620, both of which are partially extant in the Gallery's collection. The sets featured in the exhibition and are discussed in an essay on Alleyn's collection by Susan Foister.¹¹ The *Richard III* catalogue includes details about an extant set of kings and queens from the late sixteenth century that is now at Longleat, Wiltshire as well as many other paintings originally from sets. The catalogue sheds light on the culture of repetition and reproduction in portrait painting that encouraged the development of canonical likenesses and gave rise to the production of sets.

Contemporary documentary references to portrait sets are rare and often scant. Over the course of my research for this thesis I have read over two hundred inventories in an effort to identify references to portrait sets and patterns in ownership and display. However, as inventories from this period typically include little information about paintings beyond the number of pictures in a room and sometimes the subjects, it has proved difficult to recognize references to portrait sets amid larger picture collections in cases where there is no supporting evidence. Because of this paucity of substantial documentary evidence, information gathered from extant paintings has proved essential

⁸ Roy Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, 2 vols (London: HMSO, 1969) and *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture* (London: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art/Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), pp. 43-47.

⁹ Robin Gibson, 'The National Portrait Gallery's Set of Kings and Queens at Montacute House' in *National Trust Yearbook* (1975), 81-87 and 'A Jacobean Gallery of the Kings and Queens of England', *Folio* (Spring, 1995), 9-16.

¹⁰ Pamela Tudor-Craig, *Richard III* (London: NPG, 1973); *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*, ed. by Aileen Ried and Robert Maniura (London: DPG, 1994).

¹¹ *Edward Alleyn*, ed. by Reid and Maniura, p. 76, nos. 79-103 and Susan Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', pp. 33-61 in the same volume.

for this thesis.¹² The analysis of painting style, panel construction and specific features such as inscriptions or decorative spandrels, has been useful, for example, in helping to establish connections between individual paintings. In addition, information gathered from dendrochronological analysis, which in some cases has been specifically commissioned to facilitate this research, has helped to date extant sets and, where documentary evidence is lacking, to confirm that particular groups of paintings were produced together. The majority of the surviving sets discussed in this thesis have been displaced from their original location and most have either been dispersed or survive only partially intact. In an effort to better understand the function of this genre of painting and its audiences, therefore, I have attempted to trace the provenance of the chief surviving sets and in some cases, have been able to establish with a degree of certainty who the paintings were made for and where they were originally displayed. This information is important because it allows us to better understand how these portraits were used and the context in which they were viewed.

¹² Much of this evidence comes from my own close examination of a large number of paintings, but I also draw on research undertaken at the NPG as part of the 'Making Art in Tudor Britain' research project (2007-14).

Chapter 1

The Origins of Portrait Sets in England

Although the market for portrait sets did not develop until later in the period, the origins of the genre can be traced back to the early decades of the sixteenth century. The 1547 inventory taken shortly after the death of Henry VIII records the extensive portrait collection that was assembled under the first two Tudor monarchs.¹³ A significant number of the paintings recorded survive in the Royal Collection and elsewhere, including the majority of the English royal portraits. It is evident from a comparison between the inventory and the surviving paintings that the collection was accumulated over time through the acquisition of individual paintings, pairs or small groups of three or four paintings.¹⁴ However, the Crown's use of portraiture in the first half of the century sowed the seeds for the later fashion for more extensive portrait sets. As Maurice Howard has argued, the court was the dominant authority in establishing paradigms of taste in architecture and the visual arts throughout the sixteenth century, especially during the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I.¹⁵ Therefore, as the use of easel portraiture grew throughout the century, the portrait displays in the royal palaces served as a model for other collections. This led to a market for copies of paintings in the royal collections, some of which are likely to have been commissioned *en bloc*. Furthermore, conventions established at court in the first half of the century such as the display of portraits in dynastic groups and the use of the long gallery as a space in which to hang pictures, were significant factors in the development of the later fashion for sets.

¹³ *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419. Volume I: The Transcript*, ed. by David Starkey (London: Harvey Miller for the Society of Antiquaries, 1998) [hereafter *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*].

¹⁴ It should be noted, however, that not all the paintings in the royal collections are described in detail in the inventory so the possibility that there were larger sets in the collection cannot be ruled out. For example, there were 'iiii Tables painted' in the Chair House at Whitehall listed as one item, which may have been a set (*The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*, p. 235, no. 10529).

¹⁵ Maurice Howard, 'Self-Fashioning and the Classical Moment in Mid-Sixteenth-Century English Architecture' in *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c.1540-1660*, ed. by Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn (London: Reaktion, 1990), pp. 198-217 (pp. 199-201).

The Crown's Use of Portraiture Under Henry VII

The extent of the royal portrait collection acquired before 1509 is not known but it is clear that Henry VII commissioned portraits of himself and his family, primarily to be used in marriage negotiations or to be given as gifts.¹⁶ In 1502, for example, the Netherlandish painter Meynnart Wewyck was employed by the court to deliver portraits of the king, Elizabeth of York, Prince Henry and Princess Margaret to the Scottish court to be used during the celebrations of Margaret's marriage to King James V (1512-1542, reigned from 1513).¹⁷ It is likely that Meynnart was also responsible for producing the pictures.¹⁸ Frederick Hepburn has recently argued that easel portraiture was in use at Henry's court before this date, possibly as early as the 1480s.¹⁹ If so, Meynnart's portraits of Henry and Elizabeth may have based on earlier models. A portrait representing Elizabeth of York, which survives in the Royal Collection, has previously been dated to c.1502 but recent dendrochronological analysis has revealed that it could have been made in the late fifteenth century (see Table 1).²⁰ The painting is probably identical with the picture of Elizabeth of York recorded at Whitehall in an inventory taken in 1542 along with a portrait of Henry VII, two portraits of Prince Arthur, two portraits of the young Henry VIII and a portrait of Henry VII's mother, Lady Margaret Beaufort.²¹ Copies of these portraits were made for an elite few shortly after they were

¹⁶ Lorne Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985), p. xv.

¹⁷ Ibid; Jennifer Scott, 'Painting From Life? Comments on the Date and Function of the Early Portraits of *Elizabeth Woodville* and *Elizabeth of York* in the Royal Collection' in *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium - Harlaxton Medieval Studies*, ed. by Hannes Kleineke and Christian Steer, n.s., 23 (2013), 18-26 (pp. 22-23).

¹⁸ Gordon Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (The Hague: Leiden University Press, 1977), p. 52.

¹⁹ Frederick Hepburn, "'Pintor Ynglés": The earliest evidence for portraiture at the court of Henry VII' in *Painting in Britain, 1500-1630: Production, Influences and Patronage*, ed. by Tarnya Cooper, Aviva Burnstock, Maurice Howard and Edward Town (London: British Academy, forthcoming 2015).

²⁰ RCIN 403447. Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 52; Ian Tyers, 'Tree-ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the Royal Collection' (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., January 2013) [hereafter, Tyers, 'Royal Collection 2013'], pp. 25-27. I am grateful to Jennifer Scott for allowing me to view this report. For more details and images of extant royal portraits from the Royal Collection, see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, i, pp. 6-9.

²¹ *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: the Palace and its Keeper*, ed. by Maria Hayward, 2 vols (London: Illuminata Publishers for the Society of Antiquaries of London, 2004) [hereafter *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall*], II, pp. 91-94, nos. 695, 705, 706, 707, 711, 762, 763. The portraits were also recorded in the 1547 inventory. Both portraits of Arthur survive: one in the Royal Collection (RCIN 403444) (see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, i, p. 9) and one at Hever Castle, Kent.

first painted and the designs continued to be used for the rest of the period.²² The paintings of Elizabeth of York and Prince Arthur, in particular, became the standard portrait types for these sitters.

In addition to the portraits of the royal family, there were also portraits of foreign rulers in Henry VII's collection. In 1505, for example, the king received two portraits of Margaret of Austria (1480-1530, regent of the Netherlands from 1507) with whom he was engaged in marriage negotiations.²³ It is likely that portraits were also exchanged during the negotiations for the marriage of Prince Arthur to Katherine of Aragon and it was probably at this time that extant portraits of Katherine's parents, Ferdinand V of Spain, King of Aragon (1452-1516) and Queen Isabella I of Castile and León (1451-1504), entered the royal collections.²⁴ In addition to pairs such as this, small sets may have been among the paintings that Henry received as gifts. Lorne Campbell has suggested, for example, that portraits of the four Valois Dukes of Burgundy that were recorded in the 1542 and 1547 inventories of Whitehall may have been given as a small set to either Edward IV or Henry VII, possibly by Margaret of York (1446-1503).²⁵

With the exception of pairs and small family groups, there is no indication from the surviving paintings that there was an easel portrait set in Henry VII's collection. We know from documentary evidence, however, that there was a royal portrait series of some kind in the Great Hall at Richmond Palace by 1501. In that year a banquet was held in the hall to celebrate the marriage of Prince Arthur and Katherine of Aragon. The reference to the portrait series comes from an account written by an anonymous observer:

²² Scott has suggested, for example, that a portrait of Henry VII in the Society of Antiquaries (LDSAL 329) and a portrait of Henry VIII as a young man now in the Berger Collection, Denver, may be early copies of these paintings (Scott, 'Paintings From Life?', p. 26). Other early versions of the portrait of Henry VII survive, including one at Anglesey Abbey (NTIN 515569) (see Vol. 2, Table 2). A pair of portraits from the early sixteenth century representing Henry VII and Elizabeth of York survives in the collection at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire (Erna Auerbach and C. Kingsley Adams, *Paintings and Sculpture at Hatfield House* (London: Constable, 1971), pp. 34-35, nos. 9 and 10).

²³ Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures*, p. xviii. A portrait of Henry VII now at the NPG (NPG 416) was almost certainly made in 1505 to send to the Netherlands during the negotiations with Margaret of Austria.

²⁴ Scott, 'Painting From Life?', pp. 20-21.

²⁵ Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures*, pp. xx-xxi.

In the wallys and siddys of this halle, betwene the wyndowes, bethe pictures of the noble kinges of this realme, in their harnes and robes of goold; as brute, engist, king William Rufus, king Arthur, king Henry and many other of that name; king Richard, king Edward, and of thoes names, many noble waryours, and kinges of this riall realme, with ther fachons and swordes in their handes, visagid, and apperyng like bold and valiaunt knightes. Emonge thes nombre of famous kinges, in the higher parte, uppon the left hond, is the semely pictur and personage of our moost excellent and heyghe suffrayn now reigntyng uppon us... Kyng Henry the viith...²⁶

There has been much debate about the nature of the portraits in this series. The word 'picture' was commonly used at this time to refer to non-painted images including sculpted effigies.²⁷ As a result of this ambiguity, scholars remain divided on the medium in which the images are likely to have been rendered.

Gordon Kipling has argued that the portraits were painted on the walls between the windows.²⁸ In his view the series was part of a chivalric decorative scheme influenced by Henry's exposure to Burgundian court culture. He has argued that the paintings were enlarged versions of Flemish-style portraits and has suggested that the series might have been devised and even painted by Meynard Wewyck, although the evidence for this is entirely circumstantial. Other scholars including Simon Thurley, David Howarth and Bendor Grosvenor have also interpreted the pictures as a series of paintings.²⁹ For Thurley and Howarth, they are likely to have been mural paintings, perhaps inspired by medieval precedents at the English court including the images of kings in the painted chamber at Westminster Palace that were executed for Henry III in the 1260s. Grosvenor has suggested that the images were painted on large wooden panels that were fixed to the wall. He has cited the remnants of a painted frieze that is now in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, London, as a possible indication of how the

²⁶ London, College of Arms MS 1st M.13, fol. 62^v cited in Sydney Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992), p. 115.

²⁷ Anglo, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, p. 116. On the use of the word 'picture' for forms of imagery apart from paintings, see Susan Foister, 'Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth Century Inventories', *Burlington Magazine*, 123: 938 (1981), 273-82 (pp. 274-75) and Lucy Gent, *Picture and Poetry, 1560-1620: Relations Between Literature and the Visual Arts in the English Renaissance* (Leamington Spa: Hall, 1981), p. 6.

²⁸ Kipling, *The Triumph of Honour*, pp. 58-60.

²⁹ Simon Thurley, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993), p. 209; David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press, 1997), pp. 78-79 and *Lost Faces: Identity and Discovery in Tudor Royal Portraiture*, ed. by Bendor Grosvenor (London: Philip Mould, 2007), pp. 30-32.

series may have looked.³⁰ Among the fragments of the frieze, which was made in around 1515, possibly for the royal palace of Eltham in Kent, are three paintings of early English kings including Æthelstan (893/94-939, reigned from 924), who is identified by an inscription.³¹

In contrast, other scholars including Howard Colvin, Nicola Smith and Kevin Sharpe, have interpreted the Richmond pictures as a series of statues.³² The Great Hall, which measured around 100 x 40 feet, was certainly large enough to accommodate a series of full-length sculptures.³³ In addition, while there are no other known references to a series of paintings in the hall, a parliamentary survey of the palace recorded eleven statues there in 1649.³⁴ Sculptural cycles of kings were common in medieval English art and were often used to decorate both the exterior and interior of churches as well as secular buildings and civic monuments.³⁵ Surviving examples include representations of English kings from William I to Edward III on the west front Lincoln Cathedral (1350-80) and fifteenth-century statues on the choir screens of the cathedrals at both Canterbury and York.³⁶ There was also an English royal precedent: in about 1385 Richard II commissioned a series of thirteen statues representing English kings for the inner south end of Westminster Hall.³⁷ These statues were painted and gilded and some of the figures were depicted holding swords.³⁸ Lawrence Stone has argued that as models for images of kings, the series had a great influence in the fifteenth century.³⁹

³⁰ LDSAL 509.1, 509.2 and 509.3. *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007*, ed. by Sarah McCarthy, Bernard Nurse and David Gaimster (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007), pp. 80-81, nos. 47.1-2.

³¹ Dendrochronology has revealed that the English oak used for the panels was felled no earlier than 1500. I am grateful to Heather Rowland for providing this information.

³² Howard M. Colvin, *A History of the King's Works: Vol. 4, 1485-1660* (London: HMSO, 1982), p. 227; Nicola Smith, *The Royal Image and the English People* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), p. 5 and Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2009), p. 63.

³³ The hall was destroyed during the Commonwealth but its dimensions were recorded in the parliamentary survey of 1649. See 'Appendix 4: Richmond Palace', ed. by Gillian White in *John Nichols's The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I*, ed. by Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, 5 vols, (Oxford: OUP, 2014), V, pp. 96-118 (p. 100).

³⁴ Colvin, *A History of the King's Works: Vol. 4*, p. 227.

³⁵ Smith, *The Royal Image*, pp. 5-64.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7 and 13-17.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁸ Malcolm Hay, *Westminster Hall and the Medieval Kings* (London: BM, 1995), p. 8.

³⁹ Lawrence Stone, *Sculpture in Britain: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), p. 194.

Inspiration for a series of statues could also have come from imagery that Henry had witnessed in continental Europe. It is likely, for example, that he had seen the early fourteenth-century sculptures of French kings in the Grand'Salle of the Palais de la Cité in Paris. Commissioned by King Philip IV (1268-1314, reigned from 1285) in around 1299, the series began with the legendary king Pharamond and ended with Philip's father, King Philip III (1245-85, reigned from 1270).⁴⁰ Although the statues were destroyed by fire in 1618, early eye-witness accounts and a sixteenth-century view of the room by Jacques I Androuet du Cerceau (c.1510-c.1585) indicate that they were polychromatic life-sized effigies set vertically in niches between the windows of the north and south walls and on pedestals in the centre of the room.⁴¹ In the sixteenth century, the hall was used for political assemblies and for the dispensing of justice. Henry VII travelled with the French court in the first half of 1485 and may have seen the statues during this period.

Whether the kings at Richmond were statues or paintings, the purpose of the set is clear: Henry VII wished to be associated with celebrated rulers of the past and to portray himself as their legitimate successor. The series commenced with the heroic figures of Brute, Hengist and King Arthur and culminated with an image of Henry VII himself. The spectacle of these kings with their gilded robes would have been magnificent but it would also have had considerable rhetorical potential. A reference to Philip IV's Paris series in Holinshed's *Chronicles* provides an example of the way in which a series such as this could be used. In September 1528, Francis I (1494-1547, reigned from 1515) received an imperial herald at the Palais de la Cité and gave a speech in front of an assembly of French notables and foreign diplomats (including the English ambassador) during which he referred to 'The kings my predecessors and ancestors, whose pictures ar ingraven and set here in order w^t in this hall'.⁴² The kings, he argued, who had 'successively atchieved glorious acts and greatly augmented y^e realm of France' would not think him worthy to be their successor if he did not defend

⁴⁰ Andrew Martindale, *Heroes, Ancestors, Relatives and the Birth of the Portrait* (Maarssen: Gary Schwartz, 1988), pp. 25-29; Stephen Perkinson, *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late Medieval France* (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 86-88.

⁴¹ Reproduced in Perkinson, *The Likeness of the King*, p. 87, fig. 18.

⁴² Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1577), II, p. 1548.

himself and his realm against the forces of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V (1500-1558). Henry VII probably used the statues at Richmond in a similar way to promote himself as a worthy successor to these heroic former kings and to justify his political moves. At the same time, the series also provided his heir with exemplary models of kingship.

All the kings named in the description of the Richmond series were renowned for their military achievements. As a conquering king himself, Henry would have been eager to associate himself with celebrated warrior kings of the past. At the time the history of Britain propagated by Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* (c.1136) was still widely accepted and the early kings depicted in the series (Brute of Troy, Hengist and Arthur) were taken from this narrative.⁴³ The inclusion of William II (known posthumously as 'Rufus'), perhaps a less obvious choice, may reflect the sources that Henry and his advisors are likely to have consulted when devising the programme.⁴⁴ Rufus's reign was short (1087-1100) and his medieval reputation in England was largely negative due to his conflicts with the church, but it was widely acknowledged that he was a skilled military leader and an early chivalric figure. The English monastic chroniclers William of Malmesbury (c.1090-c.1142) and Orderic Vitalis (1075-c.1142) both acknowledged his great military capacity, the former comparing him in this regard to Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar.⁴⁵ In addition, he was cited in John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* (1156-59) as an exemplary military leader and is believed to have served as a model for Geoffrey of Monmouth's King Arthur.⁴⁶ In France, where his reputation focused on his secular achievements rather than his conflicts with the church, he was generally portrayed more positively than he was in England. His military skills were praised by Abbot Suger of St. Denis (c.1081-1151) and he was portrayed as a chivalrous warrior king in Wace's verse chronicle, *Roman de Rou* (1160s) and Geoffrei Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis* (1130s).⁴⁷ The fact that his

⁴³ Thomas D. Kendrick, *British Antiquity* (New York: Barnes & Noble; London: Methuen, 1950, reprint edn, 1970), pp. 65-78.

⁴⁴ As Kipling has noted, modern readers might expect William the Conqueror rather than Rufus to have been included in this particular series (*The Triumph of Honour*, p. 60).

⁴⁵ Emma Mason, *King Rufus: The Life and Murder of William II of England* (Stroud: History Press, 2008), p. 15.

⁴⁶ Frank Barlow, *William Rufus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 396-97.

⁴⁷ Ibid; Mason, *King Rufus*, p. 15.

reputation as a military hero was particularly widespread in France may indicate that Henry's official historian, the Frenchman Bernard André (c.1450-1522), was involved in the creation of the set.

The Richmond series was not the only use that Henry VII made of historical royal portraiture. He also commissioned a figurative series in glass for St. George's Chapel, Windsor that included popes, kings, knights, bishops and saints.⁴⁸ In addition, the chapel at Richmond was decorated with images of saintly kings of England including Edward the Confessor and Henry VI.⁴⁹ The chapel measured around 96 x 30 feet and Colvin has argued that these images are also likely to have been statues.⁵⁰ If they were paintings, however, it is possible that they resembled a contemporary series commissioned in 1493 by Oliver King (d.1503), the king's secretary and registrar for the Order of the Garter, for the south choir of St George's Chapel, Windsor (figure 1).⁵¹ The series was painted on the back of the choir stalls and it comprised full-length portraits of Prince Henry (Henry VI's son), Edward IV, Edward V and Henry VII, all of whom King had personally served as either tutor or secretary. The figures are shown standing in niches, wearing ermine-lined cloaks and crowns. The iconography is traditional and the portraits in the series more closely resemble late medieval or early Tudor images of kings on rood screens or in illuminated manuscripts than the easel portraits found in later sets.⁵²

⁴⁸ Hilary G. Wayment, 'The Medieval Stained Glass' in *A History of the Stained Glass of St. George's Chapel, Windsor*, ed. by Sarah Brown, (Windsor: Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2005), pp. 1-63.

⁴⁹ Jennifer Scott, *The Royal Portrait: Image and Impact* (London: Royal Collection, 2010), p. 13.

⁵⁰ Colvin, *A History of the King's Works: Vol. 4*, p. 227.

⁵¹ Edward Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting in England, 1537-1837*, 2 vols (London: Country Life, 1962-70), I (1962), p. 14.

⁵² The iconography is similar, for example, to the images of kings on the late fifteenth-century rood screen at St Catherine's Church, Ludham, Norfolk (Audrey Baker, *English Panel Paintings, 1400-1558: A Survey of Figure Paintings on East Anglia Rood Screens*, ed., updated and extended by Ann Ballantyne and Pauline Plummer (London: Archetype, 2011), p. 73) and the image of Henry VI on fol. 204v of the *Nova Statuta Angliae* (London, 1488-89), BL, Hargrave MS 274.

The Influence of Henry VIII's Collections

During the reign of Henry VIII, the Crown's collection of easel portraits grew apace and posthumous portraits of English kings were acquired, probably for the first time. The evidence for this comes from a group of three portraits, still in the Royal Collection, representing Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III.⁵³ The paintings, which are almost exactly the same size (approximately 22 ¼ x 14 inches (56.5 x 35.5 cm) each), are closely related in terms of style and format and all have a similar red brocade background.⁵⁴ Recent dendrochronology has revealed that all three panels contain wood from a single tree that was felled no earlier than 1504 (see Table 1).⁵⁵ There can be little doubt, therefore, that the pictures were produced in the same workshop as a group. We can be less certain about when they were painted, however; it is possible that they were acquired in the later years of Henry VII's reign but perhaps more likely that they were commissioned by Henry VIII who, on coming to the throne, sought to fill his palaces with luxury objects and remind viewers of the illustrious line of kings from which he came.

More than any other paintings in the early royal collections, this small group of three had a considerable influence on the development of the Tudor portrait set. The paintings in this group provided the prototypes for portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III for the rest of the period. In some cases, there is evidence that pictures produced as many as eighty years later, including portraits of Richard III at the NPG and Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, derive directly from patterns taken from these paintings.⁵⁶ It is probably because these paintings were copied for some of the earliest English royal sets that the size of the panels (which are larger than most early panel portraits in the Royal Collection) became the standard size for paintings in Elizabethan sets. Although many sixteenth-century copies of these paintings survive, the portraits in the Royal Collection are the earliest known examples of each type and are probably the prime versions in this particular format.

⁵³ RCIN 403443; RCIN 403442 and RCIN 403436. See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, i, pp. 6-8.

⁵⁴ Scott, *The Royal Portrait*, p. 26.

⁵⁵ Tyers, 'Royal Collection 2013', pp. 7, 12-16.

⁵⁶ See Chapter 4, pp. 92-93.

However, there is evidence to suggest that the designs for these portraits were based on pre-existing sources, possibly even earlier paintings. In all three cases, the sitters wear costume that is broadly correct for the date of their reign.⁵⁷ In addition, other details correspond to contemporary images of the kings; for example, Henry V's distinctive cropped hair is similar to that with which he is depicted in early fifteenth-century manuscripts.⁵⁸ Unusually for a sixteenth-century English panel painting, Henry V is shown in profile and it has therefore been suggested that the portrait is derived from a lost votive image.⁵⁹ The portraits of the two more recent kings are perhaps more likely to have been derived from earlier paintings, especially as they are both depicted in a more conventional semi-profile position.⁶⁰ Even if this is the case, however, it is probable that there was an element of invention involved in making the paintings in this group. The portraits of Henry V and Henry VI both have *pentimenti* that appear to indicate that the artist was, at least in part, creating an original design rather than simply transferring a pre-existing pattern.⁶¹ As Jennifer Scott has observed, the portrait of Henry VI has a particularly sketchy underdrawing with tentative lines marking out the facial features, as opposed to the more assured lines that are usually seen in copies. Moreover, there are two significant changes to these pictures that appear to prove that they are the prime versions of these specific designs: the shape of Henry VI's hat was changed by the artist before the painting left the workshop and Richard III's proper right shoulder line was altered soon after the portrait was produced.⁶² All extant versions of these portraits follow the changes. The probable use of earlier sources indicates a concern for historical accuracy, but the alterations suggest that the paintings were not commissioned simply as copies of old, decaying pictures, but as a uniform group designed to hang together.

⁵⁷ Frederick Hepburn, *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1986), [hereafter Hepburn, *Later Plantagenets*], pp. 29-30, 45-46, 73.

⁵⁸ For example, the presentation scenes in Jean Galopes, *Le Livre Doré de la Vie de Nostre Seigneur Jesu Crist* (early 15th century), Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 213, fol. 1^r and Thomas Hoccleve, *The Regiment of Princes* (1411-32), BL, Arundel MS 38, fol. 37^r, both cited by Strong in *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, p. 144.

⁵⁹ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 50.

⁶⁰ For the arguments for the use of pre-existing paintings for these pictures, see Hepburn, *Later Plantagenets*, pp. 44-53 (Henry VI) and pp. 72-81 (Richard III).

⁶¹ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 50, no. 6; Scott, *The Royal Portrait*, p. 28.

⁶² Scott, *The Royal Portrait*, pp. 28, 31.

Henry VIII may have been motivated to acquire portraits of his predecessors by knowledge of dynastic portrait series at foreign courts. For example, Margaret of Austria, with whom the early Tudors had diplomatic contact, displayed portraits of her ancestors and the Burgundian dukes who had ruled the Netherlands before her at her palace in Mechelen.⁶³ In commissioning the portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III, it may have been Henry VIII's intention to create a dynastic portrait series of his own by adding to the paintings that he already had in his collection. We know that he already owned portraits of himself and his parents by this time; if he also owned a painting of Edward IV, he would have created a complete series of English monarchs from Henry V onwards by commissioning the paintings (excluding Edward V who was rarely included in later sets). A portrait of Edward IV survives in the Royal Collection from a slightly later date, which could be a copy of an earlier picture.⁶⁴ It is painted on a slightly larger panel than the portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III and has a brown, striped background.⁶⁵ Dendrochronology has revealed it cannot have been painted before 1524 (see Table 1).⁶⁶ There is convincing evidence, however, that the portrait derives from an earlier image. Fedja Anzelewsky has identified a late fifteenth-century engraving, probably made in the Netherlands, which closely corresponds to this portrait of Edward and all other known images of him.⁶⁷ As Anzelewsky has argued, the existence of the engraving indicates that Edward had his portrait painted during his lifetime, probably while he was in the Netherlands in 1470-71. It is possible, therefore, that the English Crown owned the original painting, or a version of it, in the early years of Henry VIII's reign.

Henry VIII's decision to acquire paintings of his predecessors may also have been influenced by humanist ideas about the display of portraits. Inspired by classical authors including Pliny the Elder (c.23-79) who extolled the edifying potential of images of exemplary figures, the display of portraits was advocated and practised by humanists in

⁶³ Dagmar Eichberger and Lisa Beaven, 'Family Members and Political Allies: The Portrait Collection of Margaret of Austria', *Art Bulletin*, 77: 2 (1995), 225-248.

⁶⁴ RCIN 403435. See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, i, p. 7.

⁶⁵ The painting measures 27 x 19 in. (67.9 x 47.9 cm).

⁶⁶ Tyers, 'Royal Collection 2013', p. 8.

⁶⁷ Fedja Anzelewsky, 'An Unidentified Portrait of King Edward IV', *Burlington Magazine*, 109: 777 (1967), 702-703+705.

Italy from the late fourteenth century.⁶⁸ Among those who were inspired was Federico da Montefeltro, Duke of Urbino (1422-1482) who commissioned a series of twenty-eight panel paintings of famous historical figures including poets, philosophers and divines, for the *studiolo* in his ducal palace in the 1470s.⁶⁹ Under Henry VII, the English court developed close ties with the court of Urbino and it is probable that these paintings were known about in England.⁷⁰ Renaissance ideas about portraiture were reflected in the writing of the English humanist Sir Thomas More (1478-1535): in *Utopia*, for example (published in 1516) the citizens of the fictional and idealized land 'set up statues of outstanding men who have served the community well, both to preserve the memory of their deeds and so that their glory might act as a spur and incitement to virtue for future generations'.⁷¹ Henry VIII had received an education that was influenced by humanism and as king he encouraged humanist learning.⁷² It is likely, therefore, that he would have been influenced by these ideas.

The tumult of the fifteenth century meant that the lives of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III provided rich material for moral instruction. Under the Tudors, Richard was generally presented as a model of bad kingship, for example in Thomas More's unfinished *History of Richard III* (written between 1513 and 1518). In contrast, Henry V was celebrated as a military hero due to his successes on the battlefield against the French. In 1513, around the time that Henry VIII was embarking on a French war of his own, a new publication known as *The First English Life of Henry Fifth* (based on an earlier work by the fifteenth-century Italian humanist Tito Livio Frulovisi) was intended

⁶⁸ On the exemplary portrait in the Renaissance, see Christiane L. Joost-Gaugier, 'The Early Beginnings of the Notion of "Uomini Famosi" and the "De Viris Illustribus" in Greco-Roman Literary Tradition', *Artibus et Historiae*, 3:6 (1982), 97-115.

⁶⁹ The portraits were painted by the Netherlandish artist Justus of Ghent (active c.1460-80) and his workshop (Clough, Cecil H., 'Art as Power in the Decoration of the Study of an Italian Renaissance Prince: The Case of Federico Da Montefeltro', *Artibus et Historiae*, 16: 31 (1995), 19-50). Fourteen of the paintings are now in the Gallerie nazionale delle Marche in Urbino and fourteen are in the Musée du Louvre, Paris.

⁷⁰ Thurley, *The Royal Palaces*, p. 86. Federico da Montefeltro had been elected Knight of the Garter in 1474 and English ambassadors had been sent to Urbino to bestow the same honour on his son in 1504.

⁷¹ Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. and ed. by Dominic Baker-Smith (London: Penguin Classics, 2012), p. 95.

⁷² Mary Thomas Crane, 'Early Tudor Humanism' in *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture*, ed. by Michael Hattaway (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 13-26 (pp. 18-19).

to provide the king with inspiration for his military activities.⁷³ The fact that Henry VIII's pictorial series of ancestors appears to have begun with Henry V is therefore significant and it is probable that the paintings were produced around this time.

An Emerging Market for Historical Royal Portraits

Although Henry VIII's paintings of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III were copied for Elizabethan royal portrait sets, there is no evidence that their production generated an immediate demand for direct copies. But a limited market for posthumous paintings of kings does appear to have developed during Henry VIII's reign. For example, a pair of arched-top panel portraits representing Edward IV and Richard III, now in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, was made for an unknown patron between 1510 and 1530 (figures 2 and 3).⁷⁴ In comparison to the portraits of these sitters in the Royal Collection, these panels are smaller (each measures around 12 $\frac{2}{3}$ x 8 inches (32 x 20.5 cm)) and there are differences in the costume and composition, but they both broadly correspond in terms of facial likeness and may be ultimately derived from the same sources. The size and format of these pictures is typical of portraits produced in England in the early years of the sixteenth century before around 1530.⁷⁵ No other versions of these portraits are known to survive, however, and it is probable that paintings of this type were made only for a very elite circle.

A more significant market for fifteenth-century kings seems to have developed in the 1530s and 1540s. The evidence for this comes primarily from surviving paintings including a portrait of Edward IV (without an arched-top) in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries that has been dated to the 1530s (figure 4).⁷⁶ The portrait is

⁷³ Marcus Cowper, *Henry V: Leadership, Strategy, Conflict* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010), p. 61; *Henry VIII: Man and Monarch*, ed. by David Starkey and Susan Doran (London: British Library, 2009), p. 35. A manuscript edition of the work was modernized and edited by C.L. Kingsford: *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911).

⁷⁴ LDSAL 321. For further details, see *Making History*, ed. by McCarthy et al, p. 84, nos. 48 and 49 and Vol. 2, Table 2. Although the portraits are known to have been in different collections in the eighteenth century, the similarities in size, format and painting style make it likely that they were produced as a pair. Furthermore, dendrochronology has found that they are painted on wood from the same tree.

⁷⁵ Comparable portraits from the early royal collections include the portrait of Prince Arthur that is now at Hever Castle and the portrait of Ferdinand of Aragon that is still in the Royal Collection.

⁷⁶ LDSAL 297.

clearly related to the Royal Collection picture of Edward although differences in the position of the sitter's hands and the costume may indicate that it was produced from an incomplete drawing or another version of the painting.⁷⁷ Further evidence of a demand for posthumous royal portraits is provided by a group of five panel paintings, now in three different collections, that were probably all produced in a single workshop in around 1540. The group includes a portrait of Henry VI at the Society of Antiquaries (figure 5), portraits of Henry VI and Edward IV at the NPG (figures 6-7) and portraits of the same two sitters in the Government Art Collection, London (figures 8-9).⁷⁸ The paintings are all approximately the same size (14 x 11 inches (36 x 28 cm)) and have a strikingly similar aesthetic. Furthermore, technical analysis undertaken at the NPG in 2007 found the painting style to be relatively consistent across the group.⁷⁹ The implication is, therefore, that by 1540, at least one English workshop existed that was responding to a demand for portraits of fifteenth-century kings.

Although the portraits in this group relate to the Royal Collection pictures of Henry VI and Edward IV, they are not direct copies. The panels are smaller and elements of the composition are slightly different. For example, the portrait of Henry VI corresponds in terms of costume and pose but the king is depicted with a slightly rounder face and slightly smaller features in the portraits in this group. The portraits of Edward have more fundamental differences: the king is shown facing the opposite way to the Royal Collection picture and his hands are in different positions in both cases. The face shape is comparable, however, and the costume is similar, albeit simplified.⁸⁰ It is possible that these portraits were made from a graphic source or earlier paintings that have now be lost. It seems, therefore, that despite this growing demand for historical royal

⁷⁷ The pattern on the king's gown in the Society of Antiquaries painting is more linear and more abstract than it is in the Royal Collection painting, and the king wears fewer rows of pearls across his chest.

⁷⁸ LDSAL 330, NPG 3542, NPG 2457, GAC 1262 and GAC 339. On these paintings, see Tarnya Cooper, 'The Enchantment of the Familiar Face: Portraits as Domestic Objects in Elizabethan and Jacobean England' in *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), pp. 157-78 (p. 166).

⁷⁹ National Portrait Gallery, *Making Art in Tudor Britain* database <<http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/matbsearch.php>> [hereafter 'MATB database'] (NPG 3542, NPG 2457) [accessed 2011] and unpublished reports on the non-NPG pictures in the MATB archive.

⁸⁰ In both portraits, the king's gown lacks the decorative detail of the Royal Collection portrait and its derivatives, but this may have been lost over time.

portraits in around 1540, access to the paintings in the royal palaces may have been limited and direct copies made using traced patterns, of the type seen later in the century, may not have been possible. Instead, drawings may have been used or prototypes from elsewhere could have been sourced.

There is no evidence that any of the paintings in this group originally belonged to larger sets of kings and queens. Although it is possible that portraits of Henry V and perhaps Richard III were originally made to hang alongside these pictures, it is perhaps more likely, given the surviving paintings, that the portraits were produced in pairs.⁸¹ Pendant portraits representing warring kings such as Henry VI and Edward IV would have had a didactic purpose, serving as a reminder of the civil conflict of the previous century. These paintings were produced at a time when the market for portraits was expanding in general.⁸² England's break from Rome in the 1530s made religious imagery contentious and simultaneously stimulated a general interest in the history of the nation.⁸³ The demand for secular images, especially those representing historical subjects, is likely to have increased as a result.

The Earliest Evidence for Sets in Aristocratic Collections

Despite the emerging market for portraits in the 1540s, there is no evidence to suggest that they were being produced in sets at this time. The consumers of easel portraits during these years were chiefly the aristocracy and a few wealthy members of the middle classes, but the inventories of their houses contain few references to groups of portraits before around 1560.⁸⁴ A rare earlier reference does occur in the 1546

⁸¹ The portraits of Edward IV at the NPG and Henry VI in the GAC were each purchased from the collection of the Earls of Ellenborough at Southam Delabere, Gloucestershire in 1947 which may mean that they were originally intended as a pair ('The Property of the late Earl of Ellenborough removed from Southam Delabere, Gloucestershire' in *Catalogue of Highly Important Paintings by Old Masters*, Sotheby's, London, 11 June 1947, lots 56 and 60). It is notable that both portraits have a green background. The portrait of Henry VI at the NPG was purchased from Frederick Yates in 1930.

⁸² Tittler, *The Face of the City*, p. 27.

⁸³ For an overview of the effect that the Reformation had on visual art in England, see Maurice Howard, 'Art and the Reformation' in *The History of British Art, 600-1600*, ed. by Tim Ayers (London: Tate, 2008), pp. 232-41.

⁸⁴ This conclusion is based on a study of around thirty inventories taken during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I. Important examples include an inventory of the Vyne, Hampshire, taken in February 1540/41, which records hangings in most rooms but no paintings

inventory of Kenninghall, the Norfolk seat of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk (1473-1554), which has been cited as possible evidence of a set.⁸⁵ As I will argue here, however, it is unlikely that the twenty-eight ‘vysenamies of divers noble persons’ listed in the long gallery did include a set, although the group almost certainly included copies of portraits owned by the king. Evidence for this comes from an inventory of the house that was taken in around 1578, some six years after the execution for treason of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk (1538-1572).⁸⁶ A number of portraits listed in the house at this time depicted figures from the first half of the century that are likely to have entered the family collection under the third duke. Beyond the fact that these paintings primarily depicted foreign notables, there are no obvious groups among them that are likely to have comprised a set.

The 1578 inventory records thirty-one pictures at the house, at least twenty-five of which were portraits. At that time Kenninghall was owned by Philip Howard (1557-1595, later 13th Earl of Arundel) but most of the pictures in the house are likely to have been collected by the third and fourth dukes. Ten of the portraits recorded in the inventory are listed only as ‘smale pyctures of diverse p[er]sonages’ but the names of the sitters are given for the other fifteen. It is possible that the ten unnamed portraits comprised a set, but the fact that they were listed as ‘diverse personages’ suggests they did not. Apart from family portraits (two of the third duke, one of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (c.1517-47) and an unfinished portrait of the fourth duke), the collection primarily included portraits of foreign rulers and notables who were alive in the first half of the sixteenth century.⁸⁷ The figures represented were Francis I of France; Charlemagne (c.747-c.814); Mary of Austria (1505-1558), queen consort of Hungary

(Maurice Howard and Edward Wilson, *The Vyne: A Tudor House Revealed* (London: National Trust, 2003), pp. 142-45) and an inventory of the goods of Thomas Darcy, Baron Darcy (d.1537) compiled in 1520 (TNA, SP 1/21, fol. 67).

⁸⁵ TNA LR 2/115, fols. 1-66. Foister, ‘Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century Inventories’, p. 278; Maurice Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics, 1490-1550* (London: Philip, 1987), p. 116.

⁸⁶ *Inrolment of Deeds &c and Inventory of Plate, Pictures, Wardrobe, &c* (1578), Arundel Castle, MS Bibliotheca Norfolciana, fols 183ff. In the inventory, the 4th Duke is referred to as ‘My Lord Grace’ so it is possible that this document is a copy of an inventory taken during his lifetime or shortly after his death. The inventory is cited in Neville Williams, *A Tudor Tragedy: Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964), p. 43-44 and John Martin Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1995), p. 55-56.

⁸⁷ One of the portraits of the 3rd Duke was almost certainly the portrait by Holbein painted in c.1539 that is now in the Royal Collection (RCIN 404439). Another version of the portrait is still in the family collection at Arundel Castle.

and Governor of the Netherlands from 1531; the Duke of Bourbon (probably Charles III, Duke of Bourbon (1490-1527)); the Count of Nassau (probably Englebert II (1451-1504)); the 'L[ord] of Raveston' (probably Philip of Cleves, Lord of Ravenstein (1456-1528)); Ferdinand of Aragon; Louis XII of France (1462-1515, reigned from 1498); 'Kynge Charles' (probably Charles VIII (1470-1498) or Charles IX of France (1550-1574)) and 'Jaquelyn, Countisse of Maynar'. The only English monarch listed was Richard III.

The named sitters correspond almost exactly to a collection of nine small, arched-top paintings in the Society of Antiquaries that were all bequeathed by the antiquary Thomas Kerrich (1748-1828).⁸⁸ The provenance of these portraits is not known and it is therefore possible that these are the exact paintings that were formerly at Kenninghall. All nine paintings are of a similar format and it is thought that some may be by the same artist, but there are variations in the size of the panels across the group and they are not thought to have been produced as a single set.⁸⁹ Apart from Englebert II and Philip of Cleves, all the other sitters represented in the Society of Antiquaries group were listed among the paintings at Whitehall in 1542 and 1547.⁹⁰ Henry VIII also owned portraits of some of the other sitters represented at Kenninghall, namely Mary of Austria and the Duke of Bourbon.⁹¹ As a pre-eminent peer and Knight of the Garter from 1510, Norfolk would have been familiar with many of the paintings in the royal palaces and is likely to have been able to arrange access to them for the purpose of copying. It is probable that

⁸⁸ LDSAL 321 (Richard III); LDSAL 325 (Francis I); LDSAL 324 (Louis XII); LDSAL 319 (Charlemagne); LDSAL 328 (Philip of Cleves); LDSAL 327 (Englebert II) and LDSAL 323 (Ferdinand of Aragon). The only sitters in the arched-top group at the Society of Antiquaries not represented at Kenninghall in 1578 are Christian II of Denmark (1481-1559, ruled Denmark 1513-23) (LDSAL 326) and Edward IV (the painting mentioned above on p. 17) (LDSAL 320). Most measure approximately 12 ½ x 8 in. (31.75 x 20.3 cm).

⁸⁹ The portraits of Philip of Cleves, Englebert II and Christian II may be by a single hand (Society of Antiquaries of London, *Portraying the Past: Paintings from the Society of Antiquaries of London* (unpublished exhibition leaflet, July 2014)).

⁹⁰ *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*, pp. 237-39, nos. 10576 (Francis I), 10644 (Louis XII), 10682 (Charlemagne), 10703 (Ferdinand of Aragon) (all at Whitehall in 1542 and 1547) and p. 38, no. 15366 (Christian II) (at St James's in 1549/50).

⁹¹ *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*, pp. 237-38, nos. 10598 ('Quene of Hungerye beinge Regent of Flanders') and 10654 ('Duke of Burbonne'). A non-arched-topped portrait of Mary of Austria painted on vellum stretched on panel was bequeathed to the Society of Antiquaries by Kerrich in 1828 (LDSAL 340).

they were commissioned in the 1520s or 1530s specifically to decorate the newly built mansion at Kenninghall.⁹²

As Richard III was the only English monarch listed among the portraits at Kenninghall in 1578, it seems unlikely that there was a set of English kings and queens at the house by this time. An inventory of Kenninghall taken in 1571 listed ‘Eleven pcyctures of kynges and Quenes’ in the long gallery but in light of the evidence from the 1578 inventory, it is probable that these were the paintings of the foreign rulers listed above.⁹³ The fact that a leading nobleman such as Norfolk did not have a royal set in his collection by 1571 indicates that the fashion had not yet taken hold among the aristocracy. Records of other important mid-century collections appear to support this conclusion. For example, an inventory of Baynard’s Castle, the London home of Henry Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke (1506/7-1570), compiled in January 1561/62, contains no obvious references to sets.⁹⁴ Nearly sixty paintings were recorded at the house, over thirty of which were portraits depicting family members, peers and kings and queens. The royal portraits include paintings of Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Elizabeth I, Mary I and Philip II of Spain, but no earlier monarchs. It is possible that the first four, which are listed together in the inventory, comprised a small set, but it is more probable that each was acquired separately, probably while the monarch in question was on the throne. The portraits of Mary and Philip appear later in the inventory and were probably a pair. There are no other groups of sitters among the portraits that are likely to have been made as a set except, perhaps, for the unnamed ‘Ffowre small pictures of gentlewomen’ and ‘vii small pictures of [*sic*] paper’ which could have been either paintings on paper or prints.

Despite the apparent absence of sets in early Elizabethan picture collections, there is evidence to suggest that the portraits in these collections were usually displayed in categories, which is likely to have contributed to the later fashion for sets. If the inventory of Baynard’s Castle reflected the hang, for example, the portraits of Henry

⁹² On the building of Kenninghall, see Robinson, *The Dukes of Norfolk*, p. 37.

⁹³ TNA SP 12/81, fol. 69^v (cited in Foister, ‘Painting and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century Inventories’, p. 278).

⁹⁴ Elizabeth Goldring, ‘An Important Early Picture Collection: The Earl of Pembroke’s 1561/62 Inventory and the Provenance of Holbein’s ‘Christina of Denmark’, *Burlington Magazine*, 144: 1188 (2002), 157-160 (p. 160).

VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth were probably displayed as a small group. Further evidence of this approach to display is provided by an inventory of the portrait collection at Lambeth Palace, London taken on the death of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury (1504-1575).⁹⁵ The inventory includes forty-five paintings, each of which is listed by name (or title) of sitter. For the most part, the pictures are grouped in categories that appear to reflect a broadly programmatic approach to the arrangement of the portraits. For instance, one of the groups comprises portraits of Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, Edward VI, Jane Seymour, Elizabeth I, Henry VII and Lady Margaret Beaufort. The valuations given to the paintings indicate that this was not a set: the portraits of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn were valued at 10 shillings each and the rest at only 6 shillings each, but the fact that the paintings are listed in a group indicates that they had effectively become a set within the collection. Another group includes portraits of Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560) and John Wyclif (*d.* 1384), all figures associated with the reform of the church, and elsewhere, portraits of English statesmen are grouped with images of their peers and contemporaries.

Perhaps the strongest indication that the taste for portrait sets among the aristocracy did not develop until around 1580, is the fact that the earliest known surviving examples date from around this time. One of the earliest private patrons to commission a set of easel portraits was probably the renowned collector John Lumley, 1st Baron Lumley (*c.* 1533-1609). An extant set of full-length portraits on canvas representing fifteen of Lumley's ancestors that probably dates from the 1580s was recorded in an inventory of his collection taken in 1590, along with what may have been a set of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century English kings and queens.⁹⁶ Although the inventory does not record the location of these paintings, it is probable that both series were originally displayed at Lumley Castle near Chester-le-Street, County Durham.⁹⁷ There may also have been

⁹⁵ William Sandys, 'Copy of the Inventory of Archbishop Parker's Goods at the time of his Death; communicated by William Sandys, Esq. F.S.A., in a Letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S. Secretary', *Archaeologia*, 30 (1844), 1-30.

⁹⁶ On Lumley's collection, see *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age*, ed. by Mark Evans (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), which includes a facsimile of the inventory. The ancestors are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, p. 67 and the kings and queens are discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 95-96.

⁹⁷ The ancestors were recorded in an inventory of Lumley Castle taken in 1609 along with over 200 unnamed pictures (Mary Hervey, 'The Lumley Inventory of 1609', in *Sixth Volume of the Walpole Society* (Oxford: OUP, 1918), pp. 36-46 (pp. 42-43)).

other sets among the 255 paintings that Lumley owned in 1590. The inventory lists, for example, a group of portraits representing sixteenth-century bishops (Thomas Wolsey (1470/71-1530), Reginald Pole (1500-1558), Stephen Gardiner (c.1595-1555) and John Fisher (c.1469-1535)) and a small group of Italian writers (Giovanni Boccaccio (1313-1375), Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) and Ludovico Ariosto (1474-1533)).⁹⁸ As the collection is no longer intact and many of the paintings are lost it is difficult to ascertain whether these groups were produced as sets or if they were simply arranged in categories on the walls or for the purposes of the inventory.⁹⁹ However, the survival of the portraits of ancestors provides conclusive evidence that portrait sets were being produced for aristocratic collections by this point.¹⁰⁰

As Roy Strong has argued, where aristocratic collections were concerned, fashions in portraiture in the sixteenth century were determined to a great extent by the architectural developments of the period, especially the introduction of the long gallery.¹⁰¹ It is no coincidence that the demand for portrait sets grew during a particularly fertile period of secular building activity that began around the 1570s and continued into the reign of James VI and I.¹⁰² Although the Crown built little during these years, there was much activity among the nobility and wealthy gentry, particularly the ‘new men’ whose social status had risen as a result of Elizabeth’s patronage.¹⁰³ New building was a measure of success, and refurbishment, a sign of elevated status.¹⁰⁴ In addition, courtiers were

⁹⁸ Catharine Macleod, Tarnya Cooper and Margaret Zoller, ‘Appendix Three: A List of Portraits in the Lumley Inventory’ in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, pp. 157-164 (pp. 160, 162-63).

⁹⁹ The collection was partially dispersed after the death of Lumley’s second wife in 1617 when some of the paintings entered the Royal Collection. Others were sold from Lumley Castle in 1785 and 1807 (Hervey, ‘The Lumley Inventory’, p. 36). Some of the paintings remain in the collection of the Earl of Scarbrough at Lumley Castle and elsewhere.

¹⁰⁰ Catharine MacLeod, Tarnya Cooper and Margaret Zoller, ‘The Portraits’, in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, pp. 59-70 (p. 59).

¹⁰¹ Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 45. On the development of the long gallery in England see Colvin, *A History of the King’s Works: Vol. 4*, pp. 17-20; Rosalys Coope, ‘The “Long Gallery”: Its Origins, Development, Use and Decoration’, *Architectural History*, 29 (1986), 43-84; Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, pp. 116-18 and Mark Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2009), pp. 69-71.

¹⁰² Tara Hamling, *Decorating the “Godly” Household: Religious Art in Post-Reformation Britain* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2010), pp. 67-68. See Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 550-52 on the socio-economic reasons for new building in the 1570s and 1580s and p. 552 on the building competition among the courtiers of James VI and I.

¹⁰³ Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, pp. 2-4.

¹⁰⁴ Maurice Howard, *The Building of Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2008), p. 3.

expected to own houses that were sufficiently grand for the monarch to visit. Elizabeth and James both visited the houses of their leading servants more frequently than their sixteenth-century predecessors and as a result country houses were built and decorated or refurbished with the potential of a royal visit in mind.¹⁰⁵ By his own admission, for example, William Cecil (1520/21-1598) began building Theobalds, his Hertfordshire mansion, ‘with a mean measure’ but increased his spending ‘by occasion of her Majesty’s often coming’.¹⁰⁶ Theobalds was built between 1564 and c.1585 and became one of the grandest and most influential Elizabethan houses in the country.¹⁰⁷ Elizabeth first visited Theobalds in 1571, the year in which she created Cecil 1st Baron Burghley, and went on to visit a further twelve times.¹⁰⁸

The majority of the houses built by the aristocracy during the reigns of Elizabeth and James included a long gallery. The term ‘gallery’ was originally used to refer to a corridor or an external structure built to link separate buildings but by the Elizabethan period it had come to refer to a long room with high ceilings, often spanning the entire length of a building, which was chiefly used for recreation and exercise.¹⁰⁹ Precursors to the long gallery in England include a gallery built by Edward IV at Eltham Palace in the 1470s and the numerous galleries built by Henry VII at Richmond.¹¹⁰ It was during the reign of Henry VIII, however, that the Elizabethan-style long gallery was first introduced into England. Unlike Elizabeth, Henry had been a prolific builder and during the 1530s and 1540s he had built long galleries at the palaces of Whitehall, St James’s and Nonsuch.¹¹¹ He was motivated by a rivalry with Francis I of France who was also an important patron of architecture and art.¹¹² The immediate prototype for the

¹⁰⁵ Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, p. 36. On the royal progresses and the pressures they put on the aristocracy, see Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, pp. 451-54.

¹⁰⁶ John Summerson, ‘The Building of Theobalds, 1564-1584’, *Archaeologia*, 97 (1959), 107-26 (p. 108).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid; Malcolm Airs, “‘Pomp or Glory’: The Influence of Theobalds”, in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils, 1558-1612*, ed. by Pauline Croft (New Haven and London: YUP, 2002), pp. 2-19.

¹⁰⁸ Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 18; Airs, “‘Pomp or Glory’”, p. 6.

¹⁰⁹ For a discussion of the terminology see Rosalys Coope, ‘The Gallery in England: Names and Meanings’, *Architectural History*, 27 (1984), 446-455 and Colvin, p. 17.

¹¹⁰ Coope, ‘The “Long Gallery”’, pp. 44-47 and Simon Thurley, *Hampton Court: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003), p. 22.

¹¹¹ Thurley, *Royal Palaces*, p. 39; Sharpe, pp. 147-48; Colvin, *A History of the King’s Work: Vol. 4*, p. 20.

¹¹² Howard, *Early Tudor Country House*, p. 116; Colvin, *A History of the King’s Work: Vol. 4*, p. 20.

Elizabethan-style gallery was the Queen's Gallery at Hampton Court, a room of around 180 x 25 feet that was built by Henry between 1533 and 1537.¹¹³ By the 1540s, men associated with the court were beginning to add long galleries to their own homes. For example, the royal administrator Sir William Petre (1505/6-1572) added a long gallery measuring around 94 x 18 feet to Ingatestone Hall, Essex around this time.¹¹⁴ It was not until the building boom in the second half of the century, however, that the long gallery became a widespread feature of domestic architecture in England.¹¹⁵

Although sometimes found in other rooms including libraries, parlours and halls, portrait sets acquired for private residences were most often displayed in long galleries. In 1547 and 1549/50 many of the portraits in the royal collections were displayed in the galleries at Whitehall and St. James's Palace.¹¹⁶ Others followed this example including the Dukes of Norfolk at Kenninghall. At Theobalds, Burghley built several galleries and decorated the principal state long gallery, known as the 'Great Gallery' with portraits of English monarchs and foreign notables.¹¹⁷ Portrait sets were often acquired specifically to decorate newly built or newly refurbished rooms and it is probable that this was the case at Theobalds. Certainly at Hardwick New Hall in Derbyshire, which was built by Elizabeth Talbot, Dowager Countess of Shrewsbury (c.1527-1608, known as 'Bess of Hardwick'), new portraits were acquired in the 1590s, around the time the work on the house was being completed.¹¹⁸ Paintings purchased for the house at this time include several of the royal portraits that were recorded as hanging as a series in the long gallery in 1601.¹¹⁹ As Mark Girouard has argued, between 1570 and 1620 pictures were hung in galleries 'as an obvious way of filling their often vast open spaces'.¹²⁰

¹¹³ Colvin, *A History of the King's Work: Vol. 4*, p. 20.

¹¹⁴ Coope, 'The "Long Gallery"', p. 50; F.G. Emmison, *Tudor Secretary: Sir William Petre at Court and Home* (London: Longmans, 1961), p. 32.

¹¹⁵ Coope, 'The "Long Gallery"', p. 51; Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 44; Hamling, *Decorating the "Godly" Household*, pp. 176-77.

¹¹⁶ It is probable that some of the portraits recorded at St. James's in 1549/50 were identical with those at Whitehall in 1547.

¹¹⁷ See Chapter 4, pp. 90-95.

¹¹⁸ Gillian White, "'that whyche ys nedefoulle and nesary': The Nature and Purpose of the Original Furnishings and Decoration of Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire", 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of the Renaissance, 2005) [hereafter White, 'Hardwick Hall'], I, pp. 168-170.

¹¹⁹ Santina M. Levey and Peter K. Thornton, *Of Household Stuff: The 1601 Inventories of Bess of Hardwick* (London: National Trust, 2001), pp. 42-65.

¹²⁰ Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 71.

A Bishop's Set of Heroes and Heroines

The earliest known English set of individual panel paintings depicting figures from history was not made for the house of a nobleman, but for the house of a bishop. As early as the 1520s, Robert Sherborn (c.1454-1536), Bishop of Chichester commissioned a set of paintings of ancient heroes and heroines for Amberley Castle in West Sussex.¹²¹ Sherborn had visited Rome in 1496 and 1504 on diplomatic missions for Henry VII and may have witnessed this kind of imagery on his travels.¹²² The exact date of the paintings is not known but it has been suggested that Sherborn may have devised the scheme in anticipation of a royal visit in 1526.¹²³ There are no contemporary accounts of the decoration at Amberley but a description written by Frederic Shoberl in 1813 and an accompanying illustration indicate that the set included individual paintings of 'ten ancient monarchs and their queens', which were set into panelling beneath the cornice in the Great Chamber of the Castle.¹²⁴ The paintings of the male figures are not known to survive but eight of the heroines are now in the collection of the Pallant House Gallery, Chichester.¹²⁵

The figures depicted in the surviving group are Semiramis, a legendary Assyrian queen; the Amazon queens Lamedo, Menalippe, Hippolyta and Sinope; Xenobia, Queen of the Palmyrenes; Thomyris, Queen of Massagetae and Cassandra, the legendary daughter of King Priam of Troy. Each panel measures around 45 x 33 inches (114.3 x 86.4 cm) and the images have been painted in oil and tempera. The half-length figures are depicted either in armour or early sixteenth-century-style gowns and are identified by their shields and a distich at the bottom of each panel. The verses are thought to have been devised by Sherborn, possibly using an anonymous ballad entitled *The Nine*

¹²¹ Karen Coke, 'The Amberley Castle Panels and a Drawing by William Henry Brooke', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 145 (2007), 137–52; Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting*, I, pp. 25, 154.

¹²² Jonathan Woolfson and Deborah Lush, 'Lambert Barnard in Chichester Cathedral: Ecclesiastic Politics and the Tudor Royal Image', *Antiquaries Journal*, 87 (2007), 259–80 (p. 260); Coke, 'The Amberley Castle Panels', pp. 140–41.

¹²³ Coke, 'The Amberley Castle Panels', p. 137.

¹²⁴ Frederic Shoberl, *The Beauties of England and Wales: Volume 14: Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex* (London: Harris, 1813), p. 87, cited in Coke, 'The Amberley Castle Panels', p. 138.

¹²⁵ Accession numbers CHCPH 0738 A–H. For more information and images, see Vol. 2, Appendix 3, pp. 129–133.

Ladies Worthy.¹²⁶ The set is attributed to Lambert Barnard (*d.*1567/68) who is known to have worked for Sherborn from at least 1529.¹²⁷ Little is known about Barnard but the style of painting indicates that he may have been trained in Netherlandish traditions. It is likely that the designs were based on a series of woodcuts but no extant sources have been identified.

In addition to the paintings at Amberley, Sherborn also commissioned a painted scheme for the cathedral in Chichester that included two series of medallion portraits: one representing the kings of England from William I and the other representing all the bishops of the see.¹²⁸ The scheme survives in the cathedral and has also been attributed to Barnard but unlike the Amberley set, the portraits are painted in rows on large boards fixed to the walls rather than individual panels. There are large-scale narrative paintings at the centre of the scheme, one depicting Caedwalla, King of the Gewisse (*c.*659–89) granting land in Selsey (the original seat of the bishopric) to St Wilfred, and the other showing Henry VIII confirming the see to Sherborn. Edward Croft-Murray has argued that the paintings were commissioned in around 1535 to mark Sherborn's renunciation of the old religion and support of royal supremacy.¹²⁹

Mid-Century Sets of Protestant Reformers

Protestant Reformers appear to have been among the earliest subjects to be represented in easel portrait sets in England. In March 1550, the English Protestant Christopher Hales wrote a letter to Rudolph Gualter (1518-1586), a reformer based in Zurich, in which he expressed a wish to purchase a set of portraits representing a number of prominent continental reformers from Gualter's painter.¹³⁰ He asked Gualter to arrange for them to be made and sent to him in England. The portraits he required were of Zwingli, Conrad Pellican (1478-1556), Theodore Beza (1519-1605), Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) and Gualter himself. He also required a portrait of Johannes

¹²⁶ Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting*, I, p. 25. The ballad was formerly attributed to Chaucer.

¹²⁷ Edward Croft-Murray, 'Lambert Barnard: An English Early Renaissance Painter', *Archaeological Journal*, 113 (1957), 108–25 (p. 111).

¹²⁸ Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting*, I, pp. 23-24, 154-55. Portraits of Edward VI to George I have been added to the royal series at a later date.

¹²⁹ Croft-Murray, 'Lambert Barnard', pp. 109, 116.

¹³⁰ *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Volume 1*, ed. by Hastings Robinson (Cambridge: CUP, 1846-7), pp. 185-87.

Æcolampadius (1482-1531), but only if Gualter thought his artist could paint ‘a good likeness’. Hales had spent six months in Zurich the year before and it is probable that he had seen portraits of all the sitters apart from Æcolampadius while he was there.¹³¹ He requested that the portraits be painted on wood rather than canvas and that each sitter be depicted with a book in his hand. He also asked that the images be accompanied by appropriate verses. The uniform size, the verses and the common motif of the book indicate that Hales viewed the paintings as a set and intended to display the portraits together. The name of Gualter’s painter is not mentioned in the correspondence but it has been argued that it was Hans Asper (1499-1574), a Zurich-based artist who is known to have painted at least thirty portraits of leading personalities of the city.¹³²

Gualter had the portraits painted, including the portrait of Æcolampadius, which was based on a painting in the sitter’s own collection.¹³³ However, the concerns of Gualter and other Zurich-based reformers about potential idolatry meant that Hales had still not received the paintings by January the following year. In letters written to Bullinger and Gualter, Hales protested that he only required the portraits to decorate his library and to provide him with inspiration.¹³⁴ It is not known if he ever received the paintings but there are other indications that portrait sets of reformers were made for English consumers in the mid-sixteenth century. In his letters, Hales remarked that the likenesses of reformers including Martin Luther (1483-1546), Martin Bucer (1491-1551), Melancthon and Æcolampadius were ‘everywhere to be met with’ at that time, which certainly indicates that paintings of some reformers were circulating in England in the mid-sixteenth century.¹³⁵ In 1549/50 Edward VI owned a ‘foldinge Table’ depicting five doctors of the church with Luther in the middle which was probably similar to a triptych now at Knole in Kent depicting Melancthon, Luther, Johann Bugenhagen (1485-1558), Rodolphus Agricola (1443-1485) and Desiderius Erasmus (c.1466-1536).¹³⁶ There is no evidence from surviving paintings, however, that extensive sets of reformers were made at this time and the fact that Hales had to procure

¹³¹ Mary G. Winkler, ‘A Divided Heart: Idolatry and the Portraiture of Hans Asper’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 18: 2 (1987), 213-230 (p. 222).

¹³² Ibid p. 224; W.J. Torrance Kirby, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 235-44.

¹³³ Robinson, *Original Letters*, p. 194.

¹³⁴ Ibid, pp. 190-95.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*, p. 385, no. 15417; NTIN 129807-9.

his paintings from Zurich suggests that portraits of these sitters were not widely available in England.

It was perhaps not until Elizabeth I acceded to the throne in 1558 that sets of reformers began to be produced in England. There is evidence to suggest that a set was made for Whitehall Palace around this time. Baron Waldstein, a nineteen-year-old student from Moldavia, recorded seeing the set in the Shield Gallery in 1600.¹³⁷ The set comprised paintings of Zwingli, Bullinger, Gualter, Pellican, Ecolampadius, Wolfgang Musculus (1497-1563), Simon Gryner (1493-1541), Theodor Bibliander (1509-1564) and Pietro Vermigli (1499-1562), each of which was inscribed with a four-line verse, which Waldstein recorded. The portrait of Vermigli was inscribed with the date 1559 plus the sitter's age, 59. Waldstein did not record dates on any of the other paintings but the verses on some indicate that they were also produced in around 1559. For example, the verse on the portrait of Bullinger, who was born in 1504, began 'Undecimi iam nunc labuntur sidera lustris' [For five and fifty years the stars glide by] and the verse for Rudolph Gualter (born in 1518) began 'Octavi numero properantia tempora lustris' [The hurrying days of forty years are flown].¹³⁸ It is probable, therefore, that the paintings were produced as a group shortly after Elizabeth I came to the English throne bringing an end to five years of Roman Catholic rule, and may have been made specifically to celebrate the English Religious Settlement of 1559.

The paintings do not survive in the Royal Collection but there are a number of extant portraits that bear the same verses. These include a portrait of Pietro Vermigli in the collection of the NPG (figure 10); a portrait of Bullinger at the Zentralbibliothek, Zurich; a portrait of Pellican at the Museum zu Allerheiligen, Schaffhausen and a portrait of Ecolampadius at the Kunstmuseum, Basel.¹³⁹ All of the paintings have been

¹³⁷ *The Diary of Baron Waldstein: A Traveller in Elizabethan England*, trans. and ed. by G.W. Groos (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981), pp. 52-55. Waldstein's given name was Zdeněk Brtnický z Valdštejna but he is generally referred to by scholars writing in England as 'Baron Waldstein'. His diary survives as a parchment-bound book in the Vatican Library (Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS Reg. lat. 666).

¹³⁸ The English translations are taken from *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 54.

¹³⁹ The portraits of Bullinger and Pellican are reproduced in Winkler, 'A Divided Heart', pp. 228-29. The portrait of Vermigli (NPG 195) measures 23 ½ x 21 in. (59.7 x 54.6 cm). The other paintings are a similar size. On the portrait of Vermigli, see Cooper, *Citizen Portraits*, pp. 145-

associated with Asper. The set at Whitehall may have been sent to the queen from Zurich, or possibly even brought back by a returning Marian exile. As the Hales correspondence indicates, multiple copies of these portraits are likely to have been made. The extant portraits in Switzerland, therefore, are probably other versions that were made around the same time for continental patrons. The provenance of the portrait of Vermigli, which entered the NPG collection in 1865, is unknown and the poor condition of the painting makes it difficult to date.¹⁴⁰ However, it is inscribed with the date 1560 (LX) and the age of the sitter is also given as 60 so it is unlikely to be the painting in the Whitehall set, but may be a direct copy made the following year.

The interest in portraits of church reformers throughout Northern Europe was also reflected in the medium of print. From around the mid-sixteenth century, allegorical prints depicting groups of reformers were circulating in England.¹⁴¹ Elsewhere in Europe, printed portrait series of reformers began to appear around 1560. Chief among them were Balthasar Jenichen's series of thirty-seven etchings of *Leading personalities of the Reformation* published in Germany in the 1560s; Beza's *Icones* (Geneva, 1580) and Hendrik Hondius's *Celebrated Reformers and Men of the Religion*, a series of fifty-two prints published in the Hague in 1599 that were used to illustrate Jacob Verheiden's *Praestantium aliquot theologorum* (The Hague, 1603). Some of these prints were certainly circulating in England in the early seventeenth century and may have been imported at an earlier date.¹⁴²

An Early Set of Benefactors

A surviving group of paintings at Peterhouse College, Cambridge provides material proof that sets were occasionally produced in England from at least the 1560s although there is no evidence that other colleges at either Oxford or Cambridge

46. On the portrait of Æcolampadius see J. B. Trapp and Hubertus Schulte Herbrüggen, *The King's Good Servant: Sir Thomas More* (London: NPG, 1977), p. 71, no. 139.

¹⁴⁰ It has been transferred from panel to canvas, probably in the nineteenth or twentieth century.

¹⁴¹ Pamela Tudor-Craig, 'Group Portraits of the Protestant Reformers' in *Art Re-formed: Re-assessing the Impact of the Reformation on the Visual Arts*, ed. by Tara Hamling and Richard L. Williams (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007), pp. 87-102.

¹⁴² The prints published in both Beza and Verheiden were used as sources for decorative artists from at least 1608 when they were included in a miscellany of patterns compiled by the London craftsman Thomas Trevilian (b. 1548). See Chapter 2, pp. 42-43.

followed this example. The set, which depicts benefactors and former masters of the college, initially comprised twenty paintings, which were produced in around 1565.¹⁴³ Three more were added in around 1589 and two more had been added by 1617. The earliest sitters represented are Hugh de Balsham, Bishop of Ely (*d.*1286), who founded the college in 1284, and Edward I, from whom the bishop received the royal charter. The set survives at Peterhouse although it is not in its original location. The paintings were originally made for the Stone Parlour at the west end of the Old Combination Room where they were displayed in the upper two rows of the wainscot that covered the walls.¹⁴⁴ The room was used daily by fellows of the college for meetings and recreation; the paintings were probably intended to inspire these men and perhaps encourage future bequests.

Inscriptions on the paintings identify the sitters, but originally there were also Latin distichs beneath each panel that recorded further details about their lives. The verses, which were probably painted directly onto the wainscot, were recorded by Francis Blomefield in his *Collectanea Cantabrigiensa* (1751), probably just before the panels were moved to the Master's Lodge in 1748-50.¹⁴⁵ The portraits themselves are rather crude in style and are likely to have been produced by local painters.¹⁴⁶ It is clear from the style and format of the paintings that they were produced as a set although they were probably made by several different hands.¹⁴⁷ The university colleges of Oxford and Cambridge and other educational institutions began to commission single easel portraits of founders and benefactors from the early sixteenth century, but did so much more

¹⁴³ On this set, see Tittler, *The Face of the City*, pp. 43-44 and 169-72 and Ian Tyers, 'Tree-Ring Analysis of a Series of Panel Paintings from Peterhouse College, Cambridge' (unpublished report, University of Sheffield, 2003). I am grateful to the Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge for allowing me to view this report. For more on the paintings, see Vol. 2, Appendix 4, pp. 134-38.

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Fuller, *The church-history of Britain: from the birth of Jesus Christ untill the year M.DC.XLVIII* (London: John Williams, 1655), Section 2, p. 32; Francis Blomefield, *Collectanea Cantabrigiensa, Or Collections Relating to Cambridge* (Norwich: printed for the author, 1751), p. 158.

¹⁴⁵ Blomefield, *Collectanea Cantabrigiensa*, pp. 158-62; *Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 3: The City and University of Cambridge*, ed. by J.P.C. Roach (Oxford: OUP, 1959), pp. 333-40; Tittler, *The Face of the City*, p. 43.

¹⁴⁶ Tittler, *The Face of the City*, pp. 43-44.

¹⁴⁷ According to Tittler, the paintings produced in *c.*1565 have all been attributed to a single hand (Tittler, *The Face of the City*, p. 43). Although I have viewed the paintings, I was unable to examine the majority of them at close range as some are displayed up high in the college hall. However, in appearance they are very similar and were certainly made to hang as a series.

frequently from the 1560s onwards.¹⁴⁸ However, the Peterhouse set may have been unique; no comparable sets are known to have been made for colleges in either Oxford or Cambridge in this period.

Conclusions

The evidence presented in this chapter shows that although portraits may occasionally have been made in sets in the first half of the sixteenth century, a significant market for easel portrait sets did not develop until the reign of Elizabeth I. Bishop Sherborn's set of heroes and heroines at Amberley Castle is likely to have been a relatively unusual example, probably directly inspired by examples on the continent. However, the use of portraiture at the English court under Henry VII and Henry VIII not only provided authoritative prototypes of royal figures, but also encouraged the display of portraits in dynastic categories and pioneered the use of the long gallery as a space to hang pictures. Furthermore, both Henry VII and Henry VIII demonstrated the rhetorical potential of the royal portrait series, using images of ancestors and predecessors to communicate messages of legitimacy, authority and longevity. Later in the century, as I will show in Chapter 3, others would use easel portrait sets to make similar statements.

¹⁴⁸ Tittler, *The Face of the City*, pp. 37-44.

Chapter 2

Continental Influences on English Painted Sets

The fashion for portrait sets in Elizabethan England can be attributed in part to artistic trends on the continent. In the first half of the century, elements of art and design from Italy, France and the Low Countries entered England through the Crown's patronage of foreign artists and craftsmen, and the luxury goods that were imported from the continent by elite patrons.¹⁴⁹ Under Elizabeth, most continental influence came from the Netherlands. Netherlandish artisans, including painters and printers, came to England in significant numbers as refugees in the 1560s and 1580s to avoid religious persecution under the Spanish, bringing with them new techniques, ideas and pattern books.¹⁵⁰ In addition, many of the luxury goods imported into England from the continent came through Antwerp, including tapestry hangings, books and prints. As a result, decorative artists in England frequently used Dutch and Flemish designs.¹⁵¹ Single-sheet engravings and illustrated books imported from the continent not only provided sources for artists in England, but they helped to stimulate a market for portrait cycles in a variety of media and inspired printmakers and booksellers in England to publish homegrown versions.

¹⁴⁹ In *The Triumph of Honour* Kipling argued that Henry VII modelled his court almost exclusively on that of the dukes of Burgundy but it has since been argued that he was also influenced by French and Italian models (Steven Gunn, 'The Court of Henry VII', in *The Court as a Stage: England and the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. by Steven Gunn and Antheum Janse (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 132-144 (p. 142)). For Henry VII's patronage of Italian artists (namely the sculptors Benedetto da Maiano (1442-1497) and Guido Mazzoni (d.1518)), see Edward Chaney, 'The Italianate Evolution of English Collecting' in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. by Edward Chaney (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003), pp. 1-124 (p. 32). The foreign artists employed by Henry VIII included the Italian sculptor Pietro Torrigiani (1472-1528) and Holbein, who was from Augsburg in Germany. On the influence of Italianate design in the first half of the century, see John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830*, 9th edn (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993), pp. 29-32 and Howard, *The Early Tudor Country House*, pp. 121-26.

¹⁵⁰ On the influence that refugees had on the print trade in England, see Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: BM, 1998), p. 13.

¹⁵¹ Anthony Wells-Cole, *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Influence of Continental Prints, 1558-1625* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1997). For the influence of Netherlandish prints, see pp. 43-123.

It is difficult to assess to what extent painted portrait sets made on the continent stimulated a demand for this type of painting in England. I have found no evidence that easel portrait sets were imported from Europe before the early seventeenth century, except, perhaps, for the sets of reformers sent from Zurich. But continental portrait sets are likely to have been seen by English travellers who may have brought back the idea, if not the paintings. Sets of painted portraits were certainly not an exclusively English phenomenon. Painted dynastic series began to appear in European courts in the fourteenth century, to begin with in the form of mural paintings.¹⁵² By the reign of Elizabeth I, easel paintings of ancestors, relatives and allies were displayed in royal palaces across Europe, some of which may have been produced as sets. The collection of Margaret of Austria has already been mentioned in Chapter 1 and it is likely that other rulers, including the Landgrave of Hesse whose collection included around 140 portraits of ‘all the Princes of Christendome’ in 1596, contained similar dynastic groups.¹⁵³ In Denmark, the artist Anthonius Samfleth was paid to produce a series of 117 painted portraits of former kings for the court in 1574.¹⁵⁴ In addition, dynastic sets could be seen in some civic buildings on the continent. In the Netherlands, for example, a painted series of the Counts and Countesses of Holland was made for the City Hall in Haarlem in the late fifteenth century.¹⁵⁵

Uomini Famosi

As I have argued in Chapter 1, sixteenth-century English patrons are likely to have been inspired to display portraits of historical and exemplary figures by humanist ideas about portraiture that originated in Italy in the fourteenth century. The rediscovery of ancient writers by early humanists including Petrarch led to the development of a category of secular painting that has been loosely termed *uomini famosi* or *uomini*

¹⁵² For early examples see Martindale, *Heroes, Ancestors, Relatives*, p. 9.

¹⁵³ The paintings were seen by Sir Edward Monings who was part of an English delegation sent to represent Elizabeth I at the christening of the Landgrave’s daughter (Edward Monings, *The Landgrave of Hessen his princelie receiving of her Majesties ambassador* (London: printed by Robert Robinson, 1596)).

¹⁵⁴ Vibeke Woldbye, ‘Flemish Tapestry Weavers in the Service of Nordic Kings’ in *Flemish Tapestry Weavers Abroad: Emigration and the Founding of Manufactories in Europe*, ed. by Guy Delmarcel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), pp. 91-112 (p. 95, note 11).

¹⁵⁵ The series is still extant. For more information and images, see *Medieval Memoria Online* database, Utrecht University, 2013 <<http://memodatabase.hum.uu.nl/memo-is/detail/index?detailId=748&detailType=MemorialObject>> [accessed 1 August 2014].

illustri.¹⁵⁶ The tradition began with fresco cycles that depicted figures from history including ancient philosophers, rulers and warriors, biblical and pagan exemplars and allegorical personifications including the vices and the virtues. Famous examples including a series of frescoes painted for Cardinal Giordano Orsini (d.1438) for his palace in Rome in c.1430 that included 300 full-length figures representing exemplars from Adam to Tamberlane.¹⁵⁷ By the mid-fifteenth century, this type of imagery was regarded as ideal decoration for princely palaces in Italy and was advocated by Leon Battista Alberti in *De re aedificatoria* (1452) and Antonio Filarete in his *Trattato di architettura* (1460-64).¹⁵⁸ Paintings such as those at the Orsini Palace became internationally famous and by the sixteenth century, the concept of *uomini famosi* had spread throughout Western Europe and into a variety of other media, including easel painting and print.

It was from this tradition of *uomini famosi* that the famed collection of the Italian cleric and historian Paolo Giovio (1483-1552) developed.¹⁵⁹ Giovio's collection consisted of over four hundred easel paintings of famous men and women, the majority of which were derived from pre-existing sources. It was the first painting collection of a type that was to be emulated elsewhere in Italy and throughout Western Europe. Giovio commissioned some of his portraits from sources such as coins, medals, drawings and other paintings, but also solicited copies of original paintings from friends.¹⁶⁰ By the time he died, the paintings hung in a specially built museum in Giovio's villa on Lake Como where they could be viewed by visitors. The villa was destroyed in 1615 but

¹⁵⁶ Joost-Gaugier, 'The Early Beginnings of the Notion of "Uomini Famosi"'; Theodor E. Mommsen, 'Petrarch and the Decoration of the Sala Vivorum Illustrium in Padua', *Art Bulletin*, 34: 2 (1952), 95-116; Randolph Starn, 'Reinventing Heroes in Renaissance Italy', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 17: 1 (1986), 67-84; Eugene Dwyer, 'André Thevet and Fulvio Orsini: The Beginnings of the Modern Tradition of Classical Portrait Iconography in France', *The Art Bulletin*, 75: 3 (1993), 467-480 and Anne Dunlop, *Painted Palaces: The Rise of Secular Art in Early Renaissance Italy* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009).

¹⁵⁷ Dunlop, *Painted Palaces*, pp. 201-202.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, pp. 26-28.

¹⁵⁹ On Giovio and his collection see Francis Haskell, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993), pp. 44-46 and Linda Klinger Aleci, 'Images of Identity: Italian Portrait Collections of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries' in *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance*, ed. by Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson (London: BM, 1998), pp. 67-79.

¹⁶⁰ Haskell, *History and its Images*, pp. 44-45.

information about the paintings has been preserved through the many copies that were made.

Among the figures depicted in the collection were rulers, popes, artists, writers and warriors including Charlemagne, Christopher Columbus (1451-1506), Attila the Hun (d.453), Saladin (1137/38-1193) and numerous princes including James V of Scotland and Henry VIII of England. The international fame of Giovio's collection was largely due to the publication in 1546 of a series of *elogia* that he composed to accompany the portraits.¹⁶¹ The first edition of the book did not include images but a series of woodcut illustrations made by Tobias Stimmer (1539-1584) were printed in new editions of the work that were published in Basel in 1575 and 1577. Francis Haskell has argued that the international reputation of Giovio's collection provided the main stimulus for the publication of the many printed portrait anthologies that appeared throughout Europe from the mid-sixteenth century onwards.¹⁶² Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), for example, was personally encouraged by Giovio to write, and eventually illustrate, his hugely influential *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori* (first published in 1550, published with illustrations in 1568).¹⁶³

Giovio's collection was accumulated over a period of time from numerous different sources, but its fame generated an interest in portraits of historical figures and encouraged others to commission portraits *en bloc*. A number of copies of Giovio's entire collection were made for palaces throughout Europe. Most famously, Cosimo I de' Medici, Duke of Florence (1519-1574) commissioned the painter Cristofano dell'Altissimo (c.1525-1605) to copy the collection in the 1550s.¹⁶⁴ The copies, which were made to a standard size and inscribed with the sitters' names, were first displayed in the Palazzo Vecchio in Florence where they were arranged in three horizontal rows along the top of the walls of the Guardaroba Nuova as part of a scheme devised by Vasari.¹⁶⁵ Later, they were moved to the Palazzo Pitti and by 1587 the set, which had

¹⁶¹ Paolo Giovio, *Elogia veris clarorum vivorum imaginibus apposita, quae in Musaeo Joviano Comi spectantur* (Venice: Tramezzino, 1546).

¹⁶² Haskell, *History and its Images*, pp. 43-44.

¹⁶³ Sharon Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), pp. 74, 85.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

¹⁶⁵ Ryan E. Gregg, 'Panorama, Power and History: Vasari and Stradano's City Views in the Palazzo Vecchio' (unpublished doctoral thesis, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, 2008), pp. 114-15. Vasari listed the portraits that had been completed by 1568 as an addendum to his

been subsequently expanded, was arranged below the cornice in the East Corridor of the Palazzo Uffizi, where they still hang.¹⁶⁶ In the early seventeenth century, copies of the Medici set were made for the Louvre in Paris and in 1611 Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales received copies as a gift.¹⁶⁷ The fame of Giovio's collection led to a demand for painted portraits of historical and illustrious figures all over Europe. Likenesses became increasingly standardized as a result; many of the portraits in Giovio's collection, for example, achieved canonical status through the multiple copies that were made.

Channels of Influence

Much of the information about continental art came to England through printed publications and the written accounts of travellers. For example, Henry Fitzalan, 12th Earl of Arundel (1512-1580) owned a copy of the 1546 edition of Giovio's *Elogia* that later passed into the collection of Lumley, his son-in-law.¹⁶⁸ Although this publication did not contain the woodcut images, it is likely to have generated an interest in historical portraits. Information about decorative trends on the continent also reached the country via English writers who had travelled overseas. Fynes Moryson (1565/66-1630), an Englishman who travelled extensively in the 1590s, published an itinerary in 1617 in which he described a number of portrait sets he had seen in other countries.¹⁶⁹ During his travels he saw a series of portraits of astronomers and philosophers in the library of the Danish nobleman and astronomer Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) on the island of Hven in Denmark.¹⁷⁰ Elsewhere, he saw a series of carved statues of the Nine Worthies on the exterior of the senate house in Hamburg, a fifteenth-century series of 170 terracotta heads of popes in Siena Cathedral and the statues of the French kings in

edition of the *Lives* published in that year (Gregg, p. 114, n. 95). Vasari also described his planned scheme for the room although this was only partially realised.

¹⁶⁶ Gloria Fossi, *The Uffizi: The Official Guide* (Florence: Giunti, 1999, updated 2009), p. 18.

¹⁶⁷ Lorne Campbell, *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1990), p. 191; Roy Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico, 2000), pp. 144-45.

¹⁶⁸ *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609*, ed. by Jayne Sears and Francis R. Johnson (London: BM, 1956), p. 170, no. 1377.

¹⁶⁹ Fynes Moryson, *An itinerary written by Fynes Moryson Gent. First in the Latine tongue, and then translated by him into English*, 3 vols (London: John Beale, 1617).

¹⁷⁰ Moryson, *An itinerary*, I, pp. 59-60. On the paintings, see John Louis Emil Dreyer, *Tycho Brahe* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014), pp. 100, 106.

the Palais de la Cité in Paris.¹⁷¹ In Italy, he saw many of the artworks at the Medici palaces including a group of paintings of popes from the house of Medici.¹⁷² Although Moryson's book was not published until 1617, he is likely to have shared his experiences with friends and acquaintances at an earlier date. Other English travellers, including those who were sent on military and diplomatic missions, are also likely to have seen portrait sets abroad and some may have been inspired to commission sets of their own on their return.

The Intellectual Context: Humanism

The tradition of *uomini famosi* had its foundations in the humanist culture of exemplarity. The rhetorical concept of the *exemplum*, whereby an illustrative anecdote was employed to make a moral point, had been described by Aristotle (384-322 BCE) and was employed by ancient writers including Marcus Varro (116-27 BCE), Livy (c.59-17), Plutarch (46-120) and Suetonius (c.69-after 122), all of whom wrote 'lives' of famous men.¹⁷³ Petrarch's *De viris illustribus* (mid 14th century), a series of biographies of Roman statesmen and generals, revived this tradition and the use of the 'historical example' as a means to achieve moral edification became an important strand of humanist pedagogy.¹⁷⁴ This idea also chimed with Protestant theology. In his *Actes and Monuments* (first published in 1563) John Foxe (1516/17-1587) called for the display of pictures of Protestant martyrs:

... me thinkes I haue good cause to wish, that like as other subjectes: even so also Kinges and Princes, which commonly delite in heroicall stories, would diligently peruse such Monumentes of martyrs, and lay them alwayes in sight, not alonely to read, but to follow, and would paynt them upon theyr walles, cups, ringes, and gates.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷¹ Moryson, *An itinerary*, I, pp. 3, 162-63 and 193. On the Siena series, see Haskell, *History and its Images*, pp. 41-42.

¹⁷² Ibid, II, p. 150.

¹⁷³ John D. Lyons, *Exemplum: The Rhetoric of Example in Early Modern France and Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 6.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid, p. 12.

¹⁷⁵ John Foxe, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church, with a universall history of the same* (London: printed by John Day, 1583), I, 'The Utilitie of this Storie', quoted in Daniel R. Woolf, 'From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700' in *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, ed. by Paulina Kewes (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 31-67 (p. 54).

Thus, humanist pedagogy and the views of leading Protestant thinkers coincided to make images of worthy historical figures both an acceptable and desirable form of decoration in Elizabethan England.

The concept of *uomini famosi* had certainly had an impact at the English court by the mid-sixteenth century. The Inner Court of Nonsuch Palace, which was built between 1538 and 1541, was decorated with a series of stucco reliefs depicting Roman emperors, classical gods and goddesses, the liberal arts, the virtues, scenes from the life of Hercules and the figures of Henry VIII and Prince Edward.¹⁷⁶ The themes echo those found in Italian painted palaces and the decoration has been interpreted as a *speculum principis* designed to instruct and inspire the prince.¹⁷⁷ Tatiana String has suggested that the easel portraits hanging in the long gallery at St James's Palace in 1549/50 were selected to serve a similar purpose.¹⁷⁸ In addition to portraits of some of Edward's predecessors, the display included pictures of Alexander the Great, King Arthur, Julius Caesar, the Valois kings of France and some of the Burgundian dukes. Beyond the court, however, it wasn't until later that the concept of *uomini famosi* began to have a significant impact. The fashion for portrait sets developed among a generation whose education had been influenced by humanist ideas.¹⁷⁹ After taking a degree at Oxford or Cambridge, the majority of those who are known to have owned sets during the reigns of Elizabeth I and James VI and I, had undertaken training in law at one of the Inns of Courts where they were schooled in humanist rhetoric.¹⁸⁰ As a result, ideas relating to the Italian Renaissance began to have a greater impact on English culture as this generation matured.

Elizabeth I's Lord Keeper, Sir Nicholas Bacon (1510-1579), who had been educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge and Gray's Inn, demonstrated his humanist learning in the decoration of his great house of Gorhambury, Hertfordshire (built between 1563

¹⁷⁶ Martin Biddle, 'The stuccoes of Nonsuch', *Burlington Magazine*, 126: 976 (1984), 411-417.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Tatiana String, *Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), p. 126.

¹⁷⁹ On the impact of humanism in England, especially in terms of education and the development of history as an academic discipline, see F.J. Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1967; reprint edn, Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004), pp. 40-78.

¹⁸⁰ Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, pp. 687-92; Jessica Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59, 1 (2006), 29-58 (pp. 33-34).

and 1568). The decoration included a series of moralizing sententiae taken from classical authors, primarily Seneca (4 BCE-65 CE) and busts of Greek and Roman Emperors, which decorated the ceiling of the long gallery.¹⁸¹ Bacon was an enthusiastic classical scholar and believed moral guidance could be gained from the words and lives of the ancients. For others, however, adequate exemplars could be found closer to home. In the preface to *A myrroure for magistrates* (1559) [hereafter called the *Mirror*], a collection of poems about fallen princes inspired by Boccaccio's humanist work *De Casibus Vivorum Illustrium* (1356-1360), William Baldwin argued:

...the goodnes or baddnes of any Realme lieth in the goodnes or badnes of the Rulers [...] I neede not go eyther to the Romaines or Greekes for the profe hereof, neither yet to the Jewes, or other nations [...] Our owne countrey stories (if we reade and marke them) will shewe us examples...¹⁸²

The stories in the *Mirror*, which were all taken from relatively recent history, were intended to entertain, but also to provide moral guidance by encouraging readers to see contemporary situations reflected in the tales. The publication was a great commercial success and was re-issued at regular intervals throughout the second half of the century.¹⁸³ There is some evidence that the work had an impact on decorative art. Whereas Bacon chose the words of Seneca to adorn his house, others, it seems chose words from the *Mirror*. In his 1596 pamphlet *Have with you to Saffron-Walden*, the writer Thomas Nash claimed that 'Baldwin's moral sentences' were 'all snatcht up for Painters posies'.¹⁸⁴ It is possible that some of these 'posies', or verses, were painted on or beside portraits of the protagonists in the *Mirror*.

¹⁸¹ Elizabeth McCutcheon, *Sir Nicholas Bacon's Great House Sententiae* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1977).

¹⁸² William Baldwin and others, *A myrroure for magistrates* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1559), 'The Epistle'. The immediate model for the *Mirror* was John Lydgate's *The Fall of Princes* (c.1431-39), an English version in the *De Casibus* tradition.

¹⁸³ On the popularity of the *Mirror*, see Scott Lucas, 'A Mirror for Magistrates: Historical Tragedy and Contemporary Politics' in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* ed. by Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank (Oxford: OUP, 2009), pp. 362-371.

¹⁸⁴ Thomas Nash, *Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (London: John Danter, 1596), 'To the Reader'.

Numerical Series and Moralizing Imagery

Before around 1600, most sets of easel portraits made in England depicted kings and queens, benefactors, ecclesiastics, local heroes or ancestors – all subjects that had been represented in English art throughout the Middle Ages. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, however, sets depicting other subjects represented in Italian displays of *uomini famosi* began to appear, most notably the Twelve Sibyls and the Twelve Roman Emperors. Sibyls belonged to a category of moralizing imagery that included other figurative series such as the Nine Worthies, the Twelve Apostles and personifications of allegorical concepts such as the Seven Deadly Sins. This type of imagery was advocated as ideal princely decoration by Filarete as early as the 1460s and had subsequently become widespread throughout Western Europe. It began to have a significant impact on decorative art in England towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, largely due to the circulation of printed sources produced in the Netherlands.¹⁸⁵

The extent to which this type of imagery featured in the repertoire of decorative artists in England by the early seventeenth century is amply demonstrated by a series of three manuscript books produced by the London craftsman Thomas Trevilian (born c.1548) in c.1603, 1608 and 1616.¹⁸⁶ Each of the books served as a kind of miscellany or visual commonplace book containing material extracted by Trevilian from a variety of sources including almanacs, chronicles, the Geneva Bible, pattern books and prints.¹⁸⁷ The books consist of handwritten text, coloured drawings and many pages of patterns to be used in embroidery, plasterwork, woodwork and decorative painting. Numerical series

¹⁸⁵ On the popularity of the numerical series in print across Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Malcolm Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2010), pp. 16-46.

¹⁸⁶ The manuscript produced in 1608 is in the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington (MS V.b.232). A facsimile edition was published in 2007: *The Trevelyon Miscellany of 1608: A Facsimile Edition of Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.b.232*, ed. by Heather Wolfe (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2007). The largest of the three manuscripts was produced in 1616 and is known as the 'Great Book'. It is now in the Wormsley Library, Buckinghamshire; a facsimile edition with commentary was published in 2000: *The Great Book of Thomas Trevilian: A Facsimile of the Manuscript in the Wormsley Library*, ed. by Nicolas Barker (London: Roxburghe Club, 2000). A third manuscript was identified in the library of University College, London (MS Ogden 24) in 2012 that has been tentatively dated to c.1603 (see Heather Wolfe, 'A third manuscript by Thomas Trevelyon/Trevilian' (7 December 2012) <http://collation.folger.edu/2012/12/a-third-manuscript-by-thomas-trevelyontrevelian/> [accessed 1 September 2014]).

¹⁸⁷ Trevilian listed the textual sources that he consulted and the majority of the sources for the images used in the 1608 and 1616 books are identified by Barker and Wolfe.

feature prominently; for example, the 1616 book includes images of the Five Senses, the Twelve Sibyls, the Four Continents, the Twelve Apostles and the Nine Worthies. Printed sources, mainly Dutch and Flemish engravings, have been identified for the majority of the images in Trevilian's books, which reflects common practice among decorative artists at the time.¹⁸⁸ At Knole in Kent, for example, the extant decoration on the Great Staircase (c.1606-07) includes images of the Four Ages of Man that were based on engravings by Crispijn de Passe (c.1565-1637) after Maarten de Vos (c.1532-1603), the Five Senses taken from prints by Pieter de Jode (c.1570-1634) and the Six Virtues based on designs by Johannes Sadeler I (1550-1600) after Maarten de Vos and Crispijn de Passe.¹⁸⁹

Sibyls and Prophets

On 3 November 1620, the well-known actor and founder of Dulwich College, Edward Alleyn purchased a set of individual easel paintings of twelve sibyls, nine of which survive in the collection of Dulwich Picture Gallery.¹⁹⁰ Alleyn noted in his diary that he had 'chayngd my 12 owld sybles for 12 new', which suggests he had acquired another series at an earlier date.¹⁹¹ Around the same time Alleyn also purchased a set of English kings and queens and a set of the Twelve Apostles with the Virgin and Christ.¹⁹² The apostles are not known to survive, but the paintings of kings and queens are comparable in size and style to the extant sibyls and may have come from the same source. It is likely that the series of apostles were also similar.¹⁹³ Alleyn purchased the

¹⁸⁸ *The Great Book of Thomas Trevilian*, ed. by Barker, p. 9; *The Trevelyon Miscellany of 1608*, ed. by Wolfe, p. 9. Trevelian used prints by Adriaen Collaert, Hans Collaert the elder, Crispijn de Passe the elder and Hieronymus Wierix, among others.

¹⁸⁹ Edward Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified' – Thomas Sackville and the Transformation of Knole, 1605-1608' (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sussex, 2010), pp. 190-93; Wells-Cole, *Art and Decoration*, pp. 211-12.

¹⁹⁰ Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, pp. 34-38: DPG 537, *Egyptian Sibyl*; DPG 538, *Samian Sibyl*; DPG 539, *Cumanan Sibyl*; DPG 540, *Cumaeian Sibyl*; DPG 541, *Delphic Sibyl*; DPG 542, *European Sibyl*; DPG 543, *Hellespontic Sibyl*; DPG 544, *Persian Sibyl* and DPG 545, *Tiburtine Sibyl*. The three missing sibyls are the Eritrean, the Libyan and the Phrygian. For more information and images, see Vol. 2, Appendix 5, pp. 139-143.

¹⁹¹ London, Dulwich College, Henslowe-Alleyn papers, MS 9, fol. 48^r.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, fols 23^r, 23^v and 47^v.

¹⁹³ Having written disparagingly about the sibyls, which he saw in the picture gallery at Dulwich College, Daniel Lysons described the apostles, which he saw in the 'audit-room' at the end of the gallery as 'very wretched performances' (Daniel Lysons, *The Environs of London*, 4 vols (London: T. Cadell, 1792-96), I (1792), pp. 116-17). Writing in 1791, Walpole described a visit to Dulwich College during which he saw 'an hundred mouldy portraits, among apostles, sibyls,

sibyls, along with the other sets, around the time his charitable foundation, the College of God's Gift at Dulwich, was completed and it is likely that they were purchased either to provide edifying decoration for the college, or to hang as a sign of taste and sophistication in his own manor house nearby.¹⁹⁴

Of the nine sibyls that survive, four are on canvas (Egyptian, Samian, Cumaean and Tiburtine) and five are on panel (Cumanan, Delphic, European, Hellespontic and Persian), which is difficult to explain because the similarity in style across the group indicates that the paintings were produced as a group. It may be that the paintings were produced relatively quickly using materials that the painters had to hand. A graphic source for the series has not been identified and, although most decorative cycles of sibyls were based on prints, it is possible that they were original designs. The facial features of all of the sibyls are very similar (with the exception of the Hellespontic Sibyl) which could indicate that they were painted using a life model. The images of the Cumanan Sibyl (on panel), the Tiburtine Sibyl (on canvas) and the Samian Sibyl (on canvas) are particularly close.

The sibyls were pagan prophetesses who were believed to have foretold the events in the life of Christ.¹⁹⁵ Although their origins are classical, they became important in the early Christian period as prophets of Christ and acquired a new significance during the Renaissance as classical exemplars.¹⁹⁶ The popularity of the sibyls as subjects in Italian art stemmed from the celebrated series of twelve sibyls and twelve prophets that were painted for Cardinal Orsini on the walls of the *camera paramenti* of his palace in Rome.¹⁹⁷ In England, representations of sibyls appear to have become popular in the

and Kings of England' (*Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, ed. by W.S. Lewis, 48 vols, (New Haven: YUP, 1937-83), XXI (1944), pp. 288-9). The grouping of the pictures together suggests a similar format.

¹⁹⁴ The former is perhaps more likely as the paintings appear to have been hanging in the college when Alleyn died in 1626 (Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p. 19).

¹⁹⁵ On the origin of the sibylline stories see Michael Bath, *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland* (Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 2003), pp. 196-97 and Charles Dempsey, *The Early Renaissance and Vernacular Culture* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2012), p. 123.

¹⁹⁶ On the shifting significance of the sibyls in Western Europe, see Jennifer Britnell, 'The Rise and Fall of the Sibyls in Renaissance France' in *Schooling and Society: The Ordering and Reordering of Knowledge in the Western Middle Ages*, ed. by Alasdair A. MacDonald and Michael W. Twomey (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), pp. 173-85.

¹⁹⁷ Dempsey, *The Early Renaissance*, pp. 132-206.

first two decades of the seventeenth century, probably due to the circulation of printed series from the continent. The source most frequently used by decorative artists in England was a series of engravings by Crispijn de Passe the Elder (1601). The series was copied by the English engraver Martin Droeshout (1601-39) in the 1620s and it is likely that there was another, earlier English version in circulation.¹⁹⁸ The sibyls in Trevilian's 1616 book derive from these designs, probably via the first English version. In Scotland, the designs were adapted for a painted ceiling in a house in Burntisland, Fife (c.1620) and a painted frieze at Wester Livilands in Stirling dated 1629.¹⁹⁹ Twelve sibyls were also painted on the ceiling of Cheyney Court in Herefordshire in 1611, along with a series of prophets (destroyed by fire in the nineteenth century) and nine sibyls are portrayed on the elaborate plaster and wood hall screen at Burton Agnes, Yorkshire, c.1610, a scheme that also includes the Twelve Tribes of Israel, the Four Evangelists and the Twelve Apostles.²⁰⁰

The Crispijn de Passe designs were also used for a decorative frieze of sibyls and prophets that survives at Chastleton House in Oxfordshire (figure 11).²⁰¹ The frieze is made up of twenty-four head-and-shoulder portraits in roundels, painted in oils on individual oak panels, each of which measures approximately 35 x 35 inches (88.9 x 88.9 cm) (figures 12-13). Twenty-one of the paintings are original and three are modern reconstructions.²⁰² The frieze was almost certainly made specifically for the Great Chamber, where they are nailed into panelling beneath the cornice with a single-panel space between each painting.²⁰³ In a technical study of the series undertaken in 2000, Sharon Tager concluded that the twenty-one original paintings had all been produced as

¹⁹⁸ Bath, *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland*, pp. 195-96.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, pp. 190-95. The paintings from Wester Livilands are now in the collection of National Museums Scotland (H. KL 133-38).

²⁰⁰ Hamling, *Decorating the "Godly" Household*, p. 163 and Nicholas Cooper, *The Jacobean Country House: From the Archives of Country Life* (London: Aurum, 2006), p. 112.

²⁰¹ For a detailed study of these paintings see Sharon Tager, 'A Study of the Function and Production of the 'Sibyls and Prophets' Frieze in Chastleton House, Oxfordshire' (unpublished dissertation for the Diploma in the Conservation of Easel Paintings, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2000) [hereafter Tager, 'Chastleton House'].

²⁰² NTIN 1430496.1-24. The modern reconstructions are the Cumaean Sibyl (1430496.3), the prophet Zechariah (1430496.21) and an unidentified prophet (1430496.22). They were probably painted by Alan Clutton-Brocks (1904-76), a former owner of the house (Tager, 'Chastleton House', p. 7).

²⁰³ A numbering scheme on the back of the panels that does not correspond with the present arrangement indicates that the order of the paintings may have changed at some point (Tager, 'Chastleton House', p. 9).

a set and that the materials and methods of production used are consistent with those used both in decorative painting and easel painting in Elizabethan and Jacobean England.²⁰⁴ It is likely that the frieze was commissioned in around 1612 by Walter Jones (1550-1632), a wealthy lawyer and former MP for Worcester, who built the house between 1607 and 1612.²⁰⁵ As Tager has noted, the paintings are comparable in style to an extant series of apostles in the chapel at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire that were painted for Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury (1563-1612) in 1611.²⁰⁶

No other sets of sibyls are known to survive from this period but there is documentary evidence that others existed. In 1614, for example, an inventory of the London house of Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton (1540-1614) recorded ‘eight pictures of the Sibels’ in the long gallery and a further four in the long wardrobe.²⁰⁷ The pictures were valued at five shillings each, half that of a portrait of Bishop Gardiner and considerably less than most other portraits listed, which may indicate that they were not easel portraits but perhaps prints or small decorative panels fixed to the wall like those at Chastleton. However, six years later Alleyn paid 40d (3s, 4d) for each of his sibyls, which is a comparable price if we take into account the fact that he presumably received a discount for exchanging his twelve old sibyls. It is possible, therefore, that the sibyls in Northampton’s collection were simply old or relatively poor quality easel paintings. In comparison, twelve pictures of sibyls were purchased in London in October 1621 for Blickling Hall, Norfolk at a price of sixteen shillings each.²⁰⁸ The Blickling paintings are not known to survive but from the price paid it seems likely that they were a set of individual paintings.

²⁰⁴ Ibid, pp. 24 and 44.

²⁰⁵ For a biography of Jones, see Hilary L. Turner, ‘Walter Jones of Witney, Worcester, and Chastleton: Rewriting the Past’, *Oxoniensia*, 73 (2008), 33-44. The paintings were probably the twenty-four paintings recorded in the Great Chamber in 1633 (Jonathan Marsden, ‘The Chastleton Inventory of 1633’, *Furniture History*, 36 (2000), 23-42 (p.33)).

²⁰⁶ Tager, ‘Chastleton House’, p. 13. The apostles were painted by Rowland Buckett (1571-1639) using a number of printed sources including a series by Jan I and Raphael Sadeler I that was published in c.1575-1600.

²⁰⁷ Evelyn Philip Shirley, ‘An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G., Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614, together with a transcript of his Will; prefaced by a Letter to Charles Spencer Perceval, Esq., LL.D., Director’, *Archaeologia*, 42: 2 (1870), 347-78.

²⁰⁸ National Trust, *Blickling Hall, Norfolk* (London: National Trust, 1987), p. 42.

Roman Emperors

An interest in the lives and the appearance of Roman emperors spread throughout Europe following the rediscovery of ancient texts including the lives of the first twelve caesars by Suetonius (c.121 CE) and the discovery of ancient buildings and objects. As a result, images of emperors became a popular subject in decorative art throughout Western Europe. In Italy, for example, the Great Hall of the Palazzo Trinci in Foligno was decorated with images of figures from Roman history in the early fifteenth century.²⁰⁹ In France, images of emperors, often in stone or terracotta roundels, were popular among elite patrons in the first half of the sixteenth century. Some time after 1527, for example, a series was made for the Château de Madrid, one of Francis I's palaces, and French courtiers including Florimond Robertet (d.1527) and Galiot de Genouillac (1465-1546) commissioned similar series for their homes.²¹⁰ In England, Wolsey commissioned the Italian sculptor Giovanni da Maiano (active 1520-25) to produce a series of terracotta roundels depicting figures from antiquity for Hampton Court in 1521.²¹¹ However, it wasn't until the second half of the sixteenth century that portrait cycles of Roman emperors became fashionable as interior decoration in England.

During the reign of Elizabeth I, English translations of ancient texts began to appear. Publications including Arthur Golding's *The Eycht Bookes of Caius Julius Caesar* (a translation of Julius Caesar's *De bello Gallico* published in 1565), Thomas North's *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romanes* (1579, a translation of Plutarch) and translations of Livy (1600) and Suetonius (1606) by Philemon Holland, both reflected and stimulated a general interest in ancient history. North's translation of Plutarch contained fifty medallion portraits of Greeks and Romans, which may have been used

²⁰⁹ Dunlop, *Painted Palaces*, p. 186.

²¹⁰ Thurley, *Hampton Court*, p. 24. Robertet's series depicted the Twelve Emperors and was made for the courtyard of the Hôtel d'Alluye, his town house in Blois, which was built between 1498 and 1508 (Dana Bentley-Cranch, 'An Early Sixteenth-Century French Architectural Source for the Palace of Falkland', *ROSC*, 2 (1985), 85-95). Galiot de Genouillac's series was made in c.1525-30 for the Château d'Assier in the department of Lot. Four of the roundels are now in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City (accession numbers 41.190.478-81).

²¹¹ The Hampton Court roundels are traditionally called 'Emperors' but this has recently been challenged by Kent Rawlinson: 'The terracotta roundels or 'antique heads' of Giovanni da Maiano for the English court (c.1520-32)', *Antiquaries Journal*, 94 (forthcoming, 2014).

as a source for some decorative schemes.²¹² Other books published in England that included images of emperors include a translation of Marcus Junianus Justinus, *The Historie of Justine*, published by William Jaggard in 1606 and John Speed's *The historie of Great Britaine* (1611), which featured images of medals of the Roman emperors who were connected with British history.

The interest in Roman history that these publications are likely to have inspired no doubt contributed to the fashion for images of Roman emperors among elite patrons. From the 1560s onwards, portrait sets of emperors in print, marble and possibly paint, were acquired as symbols of taste and classical learning. At Gorhambury, as we have seen, Bacon demonstrated his interest in ancient texts not only through painted *sententiae*, but also through images of Roman and Greek emperors on the ceiling of the long gallery. He also decorated the porch of the house with statues of Roman emperors and medallions carved with Roman heads.²¹³ Other elite patrons including Lumley and Robert Dudley, 1st Earl of Leicester (1532/33-1588) owned sets of marble busts of Roman emperors that had been imported from the continent.²¹⁴ Lumley's interest in Roman history was reflected in his library, which contained publications such as Richard Rainolde's *A chronicle of all the noble emperours of the Romaines* (London, 1571) and Hubert Goltz's *Vivae omnium fere imperatorum imagines* (Antwerp, 1557).²¹⁵ At Theobalds, Burghley also had a set of marble busts along with what Baron Waldstein described in 1600 as 'coloured portraits of the Roman Emperors from Julius Caesar to Domitian', which could have been either paintings or coloured prints.²¹⁶ The busts were probably a set that Burghley procured from Venice in 1561.²¹⁷ In 1586 Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632) purchased a set of twenty-four

²¹² On the images in this publication, see Ruth Samson Luborsky and Elizabeth Morley Ingram, *A Guide to English Illustrated Books, 1536-1603*, 2 vols (Tempe, Ariz.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998), I, pp. 634-36.

²¹³ McCutcheon, *Sir Nicholas Bacon's Great House Sententiae*, p. 13.

²¹⁴ Richard L. Williams, 'Collecting and Religion in Late Sixteenth-Century England', in *The Evolution of English Collecting*, ed. by Chaney, pp. 159-200 (p. 174); Susan Bracken and Maurice Howard, 'Lumley Castle and its Inventories' in *The Lumley Inventory* ed. by Evans, pp. 29-33 (p. 32)

²¹⁵ Kathryn Barron, 'The Collecting and Patronage of John, Lord Lumley (c.1535-1609)' in *The Evolution of English Collecting*, ed. by Chaney, pp. 125-158 (p. 129).

²¹⁶ *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 84.

²¹⁷ 'Elizabeth: August 1561, 1-5', *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 4: 1561-1562*, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1866), pp. 217-237, no. 364 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=72999>> [accessed 12 July 2013].

‘Antick pictures of Roman Emperors’ in an unknown material for £24.²¹⁸ In 1629 the pictures were in the earl’s library at Petworth, Sussex, along with twelve pictures of Turks, twelve pictures of Hercules’ Labours and twenty-eight other untitled pictures.²¹⁹ The number of pictures in the room at that time suggest, perhaps, that they may have been suites of prints rather than paintings.

In 1610 a set of paintings of the Twelve Emperors was made for Henry, Prince of Wales by Paulus van Velde.²²⁰ The commission may have been inspired by knowledge of continental painted series. In 1537-38, for example, Titian (*d.*1576) painted a series of emperors for Federigo Gonzago, Duke of Mantua (1500-1540) and Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640) produced a series in *c.*1600-08.²²¹ In addition to the possible sets at Theobalds and Petworth, there may have been a painted set in the Unton collection at Faringdon House, Berkshire by 1620. In an inventory taken in that year, twenty-eight pictures of Romans and emperors were recorded as hanging at the lower end of the gallery.²²² In addition, in 1605, twenty-four pictures of popes and emperors were listed in the Great Chamber at Wardour House, Wiltshire, which could have been two sets of twelve paintings.²²³

Prints and Effigy Books

Antiquarian works containing printed portraits based on coins, medals, statues and other ‘authentic’ sources, began to appear across Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century. Examples include Andrea Fulvio’s *Illustrium imagines* (Rome, 1517), which contained medallion portraits of ancient figures taken from coins, and Guillaume

²¹⁸ G. R. Batho, *The Household Papers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962), p. 75.

²¹⁹ G. R. Batho, ‘The library of the ‘Wizard’ earl: Henry Percy ninth earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)’, *The Library*, 5th ser., 15: 1, (1960), 246-261 (p. 250).

²²⁰ Erna Auerbach, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth I* (London: Athlone Press, 1954), p. 190.

²²¹ The series by Titian was later acquired by Charles I of England. Rubens went on to paint another set in the 1620s. Neither survive intact but the portrait of Otho from his later series is now in the collection of the Scunthorpe Museum and Art Gallery (1967.114.3). Michael Jaffé, ‘Rubens’ Roman Emperors’, *Burlington Magazine*, 113: 819 (1971), 297-98+300-01+303.

²²² J.G. Nichols, *The Unton Inventories relating to Wadley and Faringdon Co Berks in the Years 1596 and 1620* (London: Berkshire Ashmolean Society, 1841), p. 25.

²²³ Tabitha Barber, ‘The Arundells of Wardour: Roman Catholic patrons of art in late seventeenth-century England’, *Apollo*, 143: 410 (1996), 12-17 (p. 12).

Rouillé's *Promptuarii iconum insigniorum à seculo hominum* (Lyons, 1553). These publications led to a market across Europe for books containing short written lives accompanied by portraits. Chief among them were Vasari's *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori* (Florence, 1568), and André Thevet's *Les Vrais Pourtraits et Vies Des Hommes Illustres Gresc, Latins, et Payens Recueilliz de leur Tableaux, Livres Medalles Antiques & Modernes* (Paris, 1584). Thevet (1502-1592) was a French antiquarian and royal cosmographer.²²⁴ His book comprised 323 short biographies of illustrious figures including rulers, ecclesiastics, ancient philosophers and doctors of the church, modern scholars, warriors, sea captains and figures from the New World, 222 of which were accompanied by an engraved portrait. The images were based on paintings, sculpture, coins, medals and prints, many of which Thevet claimed to have found on his extensive international travels.

A multitude of other effigy books were published in Europe in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. They included the illustrated editions of Giovio's *Elogia* and Beza and Verheiden's books on continental reformers. In England, this type of publication began to appear towards the end of the sixteenth century. Among the first was a book published in London by John de Beauchesne in 1597 under the title *A booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England*.²²⁵ The quarto book contained woodcut bust portraits of English sovereigns from William I to Elizabeth I by an anonymous artist, each printed on a separate page alongside a short biography of the subject. The author, who was named only as 'T.T.', was long identified as the writer and translator Thomas Tymme (*d.*1620), but more recently the work has been attributed to the antiquary Thomas Talbot (born *c.*1535).²²⁶ Talbot was also responsible for devising a large engraving made by Jodocus Hondius (1563-1612) known as *Talbot's Rose* that was published in 1589.²²⁷ The print includes

²²⁴ For biographical information, see the introduction to André Thevet, *Portraits from the French Renaissance and the Wars of Religion*, trans. by Edward Benson, ed. and introduced by Roger Schlesinger (Kirkville, Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2010), pp. xiii-xxxiv.

²²⁵ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, v, pp. 160-173.

²²⁶ A copy of the book in the BL that has been signed by George Vertue and formerly belonged to Horace Walpole is annotated on the titlepage with 'T. Timms or Twyne' and the book was attributed to Thomas Timmes in Joseph Ames's *Typographical Antiquities* (London: Faden, 1749) (A.M. Hind, *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue*, 3 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1952-64), I (1952), p. 117). The book was attributed to Thomas Talbot in the second edition of the STC (Addenda, p. 311).

²²⁷ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, iv, pp. 158-59.

portrait heads in roundels of Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth and uses the same designs that appear for these figures in T.T.'s book (figures 14-15).²²⁸

Other books containing verisimilar portraits of English monarchs followed, including John Taylor's *A Briefe Remembrance of all the English Monarchs, from the Normans Conquest, untill this present* (London, 1618 and 1622) and Henry Holland's *Baziliologia, or booke of kings* (London, 1618). In addition, translations of a number of foreign publications that contained printed portraits were published in England around this time including Richard Knolles' *The generall historie of the Turkes* (London, 1603) and Jean de Serres' *A general inventorie of the history of France* (London, 1607). In 1620, Henry Holland also published the *Heroologia*, a book of portrait engravings of illustrious English men and women from the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth including monarchs, statesmen and bishops. The book, which was modelled on Verheiden's *Praestantium aliquot*, was produced by Crispijn de Passe in the Netherlands and the plates were engraved by Willem de Passe (1597/8-1636/7) and Magdalena de Passe (1600-1638). Holland provided the text and had drawings made of authoritative oil paintings for each sitter, which he then sent to the Netherlands.²²⁹ The figures depicted were all associated with the reformed church and the publication was clearly produced for a Protestant market.

In addition, single-sheet engravings and printed suites imported from the continent or produced for an English market by émigré printmakers also contributed to the popularity of printed portrait series. As early as c.1560-62, for example, the Huguenot printmaker Giles Godet published a series of woodcut portraits from Noah to Elizabeth I entitled *A Brief Abstract of the Genealogie and Race of All the Kynges of England* in

²²⁸ Both the T.T. series and *Talbot's Rose* are discussed in H.C. Levis, *Notes on the Early British Engraved Royal Portraits Issued in Various Series from 1521 to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Chiswick Press, 1917), pp. 56-61, but Levis did not make the connection between the two works.

²²⁹ Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 17; Hind, *Engraving in England*, II (1955), pp. 145-62. It is possible that Holland made the drawings himself. Three copies of the *Heroologia* survive with marginal notes written in the seventeenth century that record the provenance of each of the images. According to these notes, the engravings were based on portraits in the royal collections, at Lambeth Palace, in various private collections, from shops in the Strand and Blackfriars, at civic institutions, university colleges and from paintings in the possession of John de Critz.

London.²³⁰ The images were printed across twenty-five separate sheets and were probably intended to be displayed as a roll. The use of conventional attributes to identify the figures indicates that the series may have been informed by earlier English publications, such as John Rastell's *The pastyme of people* (London, 1529/30), which contained full-length portraits of all the kings of England from William I to Richard III, although Godet's images are much more sophisticated than Rastell's simple woodcut illustrations.²³¹ Godet also published a set of prints entitled *The story of the emporours* around the same time, which is not known to survive but is likely to have formed a similar roll depicting Roman emperors.²³²

An influential suite of engravings that is known to have been imported into England in the late sixteenth century also depicted English kings and queens. The series was by the Netherlandish artist Hendrick Goltzius (1558-1617) and was published in 1584-85.²³³ Like the Godet series, the artist used fictional likenesses for the kings up to and including Henry VII, but from Henry VIII onwards, the heads were based on life portraits (figures 16-17). The images were adapted for a series of portraits of the kings and queens of England printed across nine separate sheets that were published in London by Walter Dight in c.1610-12 and they were also used for John Taylor's 1622 book.²³⁴ Continental prints had been imported throughout the period but in the 1590s a domestic trade in single-sheet copper-plate engravings began to develop in London with companies such as Sudbury and Humble primarily selling portraits of famous figures and maps.²³⁵ Engravings from series such as the *Baziliologia* were available to buy as

²³⁰ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, ii, pp. 149-53. On Godet see Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), pp. 181-88 and Henk Dragstra, 'Between Customer and Court: *A Brief Abstract of the Genealogie and Race of All the Kynges of England* and its Lost Source', *The Library*, 7th ser., 9: 2 (2008), 127-157. It is probable that the series was first designed during Mary's reign as the portrait of Elizabeth appears to have been added to the series at a later date. Dragstra has argued that the series is likely to have been based on an earlier English source and has discussed its relationship to a similar series by Dirk Vellert that was published in Antwerp in 1534.

²³¹ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, i, pp. 144-48.

²³² Jones, *The Print in Early Modern England*, p. 42.

²³³ Walter Strauss, *Hendrick Goltzius 1558-1617: The Complete Engravings and Woodcuts* (New York: Abaris Books, 1977), pp. 344-53, nos 207-14, pp. 624 and 655. See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, iii, pp. 154-57.

²³⁴ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, vii and x, pp. 177-81 and 198-203.

²³⁵ Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 14.

single prints and it has been suggested that this market encouraged the collecting of sets.²³⁶

The availability of printed series of kings and queens and other historical figures no doubt inspired some to commission painted sets. The connection between printed series and painted sets is clear because from at least the late 1590s, prints provided the designs for many of the paintings in sets, especially those of the earlier kings. For example, the T.T. series was used in the making of a set of kings and queens now owned by the NPG and the *Baziliologia* provided some of the likenesses for Alleyn's royal set and a partially extant set now at Hever Castle, Kent.²³⁷ The extent to which printed portrait series and effigy books inspired painted decoration is exemplified by an extant mural portrait series of 202 portrait heads in the Upper Reading Room of the Bodleian Library, Oxford University that was painted between 1616 and 1618.²³⁸ The subjects depicted include philosophers and writers from the ancient world, Christian saints and church fathers, sixteenth-century reformers and theologians, Renaissance literary figures and Oxford worthies. The scheme, which survives, was probably conceived by the library's founder, Sir Thomas Bodley (1545-1613) but completed after his death under the supervision of the first librarian Thomas James (1572/73-1629). The majority of the heads are based on continental printed series including Jean Jacques Boissard's *Icones Quinquaginta Virorum Illustrum* (Frankfurt, c.1598), Thevet's *Les vrais pourtraits* and Verheiden's *Praestantium aliquot*.²³⁹ Many of the books from which the portraits were taken were recorded in the Bodleian's catalogues of 1606 and 1620.²⁴⁰

Conclusions

The taste for series of kings and queens, sibyls, emperors, heroes and other exemplars in painted sets and other media towards the end of the sixteenth century, reflected a cultural tendency to gather together stories of great deeds, virtues and examples of good government from the past. A culture of exemplarity already existed in

²³⁶ Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 21.

²³⁷ For more on these sets, see Chapter 4 and Vol. 2, Appendix 1, pp. 6-65.

²³⁸ For details of this series, see M.R.A. Bullard, 'Talking Heads: The Bodleian Frieze, its Inspiration, Sources, Designer and Significance', *Bodleian Library Record*, 14 (1994), 461-500.

²³⁹ For a full list of the known sources and a full list of the figures represented, see *ibid*, pp. 484-94.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 465-66.

England before this time but it was encouraged by humanist ideas and Protestant theology, which made portraits of worthy men and women an appropriate form of the decoration. The direct inspiration for much of this decoration came from imported continental prints and foreign printmakers working in England. Some patrons are also likely to have been inspired by written accounts of painting in Italy, France and the Netherlands and possibly examples that they had seen on trips overseas. The fame of Paolo Giovio's collection and others like it no doubt contributed to an increased interest in historical portraiture across Western Europe. Collections of this type, and the printed portrait anthologies that they inspired, led to a culture of copying and reproduction throughout Europe that made the production of portrait sets possible. As I will show in the following chapter, throughout the period there was a growing concern for 'authenticity' in portraiture in England and elsewhere, so the availability of authoritative prototypes was important for this genre of painting.

Chapter 3

History, Antiquarianism and Genealogy

A New History for England

English portrait sets invariably represented either historical figures or famous contemporary figures that had already made their mark on the nation's history. The market for these images reflected a keen interest in national history during a period of great change.²⁴¹ The popularity of works such as Robert Fabyan's *Newe cronycles of Englande and of Fraunce* (first published in 1516), Edward Hall's *The union of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre [and] Yorke*, (1547), Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577 and 1587) and John Stow's *Annales of England* (1592) attests to widespread appetite for written history, as do the myriad ballads, broadsides, plays, and works of poetry relating tales from history that were published at this time.²⁴² The sixteenth century also saw the emergence of antiquarianism as a popular pursuit among the intellectual elite and the development of history as an academic discipline.²⁴³ Interest in the nation's history among scholars and antiquarians was fuelled by the increased availability of printed material, as well as the dissemination of many manuscript texts as a result of the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII.²⁴⁴

²⁴¹ The historical culture of the Tudor and Jacobean period has been dealt with extensively by historians; a useful summary of the literature can be found in Daniel Woolf's essay 'From Hystories to the Historical'. Key texts include Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*; *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800*, ed. by Donald R. Kelley and David H. Sacks (Cambridge: CUP, 1997) and Daniel R. Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford: OUP, 2003).

²⁴² On the popularity of historical literature beyond elite circles see Louis B. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Middle-Class Taste for History', *The Journal of Modern History*, 3: 2 (1931), 175-197; Peter Burke, 'Popular History' in *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume 1: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660*, ed. by Joad Raymond (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 443-452 and Watt, *Cheap Print*. On the 'popularization' of history and the general growth of historical knowledge under Elizabeth I, see Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 202-36. Levy has argued that the enthusiasm for history plays was at its height between 1580 and 1598 (Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 225-34).

²⁴³ Daniel Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), p. 7.

²⁴⁴ On the dissemination of manuscripts see C.E. Wright, 'The Dispersal of the Libraries in the Sixteenth Century' in *The English Library Before 1700*, ed. by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright (London: Althone Press, 1958), pp. 148-175.

Antiquarianism

A new form of antiquarianism emerged in the second half of the century that both fed and stimulated an intense interest in the nation's history and its material culture in scholarly circles.²⁴⁵ English antiquarianism was influenced in part by the activities of continental humanists but it also emerged in response to domestic events especially the dissolution of the monasteries, which brought with it a profound threat to many historical documents, objects and buildings. Much of the work undertaken by sixteenth-century antiquaries, including John Leland (c.1503-1552) and Archbishop Parker, was driven by a desire among scholars to preserve the nation's material past.²⁴⁶ In addition, both Leland and Parker were tasked by the Crown to search historical manuscripts in order to find examples that could justify current political moves. In 1533, for example, Leland was commissioned by Henry VIII to find documentary sources that would provide historical as well as theological material to help the king justify his break from Rome.²⁴⁷ Under Elizabeth, antiquarian research undertaken by Parker and William Cecil was motivated by an official need to establish an historical narrative for the English church in order to support the 1559 Religious Settlement.²⁴⁸ Parker became a key figure in the re-making of the narrative of national history. During his time at Lambeth Palace, he employed a retinue of 'drawers and cutters, painters, limners, writers, and bookbinders' to help him with his searches through manuscripts and he provided support for numerous historians including Stow and Foxe.²⁴⁹

By the 1580s antiquarianism had become a widespread pursuit among members of the nobility and those who had access to texts and the means to collect and travel. The

²⁴⁵ Important works on English antiquarianism include *The English Library before 1700*, ed. by Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright (London: Althone Press, 1958); May McKisack, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971); Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought* and Angus Vine, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

²⁴⁶ Levy, *Tudor Historical Thought*, pp. 126-27.

²⁴⁷ Vine, *In Defiance of Time*, p. 24; James P. Carley, 'Leland, John (c.1503-1552)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004; online edn, May 2006) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16416>> [accessed 30 March 2013].

²⁴⁸ Wright, 'The Dispersal of the Libraries', p. 170.

²⁴⁹ Hind, *Engraving in England*, I, pp. 12-14; James A. Knapp, *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: The Representation of History in Printed Books* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), p. 178. Stow acknowledged Parker's support through his dedication in John Stow, *The annales of England* (London: Ralph Newbery, 1592).

movement was galvanized by the publication of William Camden's *Britannia* in May 1586, around which time the Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries was founded.²⁵⁰ The fashion for portrait sets involved both research and collecting and therefore engaged men such as Lumley and Burghley who sought to decorate their rooms with images that reflected these interests.²⁵¹ In addition, the taste for portrait sets reflected the tendency among historians and antiquaries to abridge and summarize history so that it could be easily remembered.²⁵² Those with an interest in history often kept commonplace books in which they recorded historical facts in easily digestible and memorable formats such as lists of names or genealogical diagrams. Among Thomas Talbot's surviving papers, for example, are lists of various English office holders including former Constables and Lieutenants of the Tower of London, Chancellors, Keepers of the Rolls and admirals, all of which he had gathered through his antiquarian searches.²⁵³ Similarly, lists of kings and queens and other historical figures written on paper or painted on wood were sometimes hung on walls. In 1577, for example, William Lovelace, a Sargeant at Law based in Canterbury, had 'a table with a frame of the kinges of this realme written' in his smaller gallery and in 1600 Baron Waldstein saw a parchment with a list of the names of kings, princes and bishops who had founded or endowed English colleges on display at Lambeth Palace.²⁵⁴

The Search for Authentic Likenesses

It was partly as a result of the antiquarian movement that the authenticity of historical portraits became increasingly important. From Petrarch onwards, historians across Europe sought to locate written descriptions and objects that would provide authoritative likenesses of historical figures. This concern for authenticity was stimulated by the widely held belief that a person's appearance, particularly their face,

²⁵⁰ C.E. Wright, 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the Formation of the Cotton Library' in *The English Library*, ed. by Wormald and Wright, pp. 176-212; McKisack, *Medieval History*, pp. 155-169 and Vine, *In Defiance of Time*, pp. 53-57.

²⁵¹ On Burghley's antiquarian activities, see Jill Husselby, 'Architecture at Burghley House: the patronage of William Cecil, 1553-1598', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, 1996), pp. 34-45. On Lumley's interests, see Barron, 'The Collecting and Patronage of John, Lord Lumley'.

²⁵² Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 266.

²⁵³ BL, Cotton MS Faustina E IV, fols 52^r-54^r and Cotton MS Faustina C IX, fols 12-25^v.

²⁵⁴ Foister, 'Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century Inventories', p. 278; *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 61.

could reveal much about their personality. Ideas about physiognomy had first been expressed in writing in the fourth century and were popular throughout the Middle Ages.²⁵⁵ In the sixteenth century the subject was discussed in relation to portraiture in a number of antiquarian works including Guillaume Rouillé's *Prima parte del Prontuario de le Medaglie* (Lyon, 1553) and Giovio's *Elogia* (1546).²⁵⁶ In England, the writer Thomas Hill (c.1528-c.1574) produced several works on the subject including *The contemplation of mankinde* (1571), which drew on a number of Italian sources and included illustrations.²⁵⁷

There was a strong connection between the study of physiognomy and historical portraiture. It has been suggested that some of the portraits in Giovio's collection may have been designed using theories relating to physiognomy.²⁵⁸ Portraiture certainly played a role in the work of the Italian philosopher Giambattista della Porta (1535-1615) whose hugely influential treatise on physiognomy, *De humana physiognomia*, was published in 1586. Della Porta used portraits to help him to formulate his theories.²⁵⁹ Although it is difficult to measure, there is evidence to suggest that physiognomic theory was taken into consideration by portrait painters in England. In the late sixteenth century, the English heraldic painter John Guillim (1550-1521) recorded in his notebook several different palettes to be used by painters according to the 'humour' of their subject.²⁶⁰ He suggested, for example, that a painter should use one set of pigments when painting a person with a choleric complexion and another for a subject with a phlegmatic complexion. It was generally believed at this time that the humours of the body affected not just the physical appearance of a person, but their personality and therefore their actions. According to Hill: 'in the Chollericke, is knowne an inclination to yre [ire]: in the Melancholick, to feare: in the Sanguine, to mirth: and

²⁵⁵ Sybille Baumach, *Shakespeare and the Art of Physiognomy* (Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks, 2008), 26; Luke Syson, 'Introduction' in *The Image of the Individual*, ed. by Mann and Syson, pp. 9-14 (p. 10).

²⁵⁶ Syson, 'Introduction', p. 10.

²⁵⁷ Baumbach, *Shakespeare and the Art of Physiognomy*, p. 31.

²⁵⁸ Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print*, p. 91.

²⁵⁹ Haskell, *History and its Images*, pp. 61-63.

²⁶⁰ Jim Murrell, 'John Guillim's Book: A Heraldic Painter's *Vade Mecum*', *Walpole Society*, 57 (1995), 1-52 (p. 20).

in the Flegmatick, to sluggishnesse'.²⁶¹ In his *Annales*, Stow recorded that King John was 'a person of an indifferent nature, but of melancholy complexion' and it is possible that written descriptions of historical figures such as this may have been given to painters so that they might depict the sitter accordingly.²⁶²

The increased concern for authenticity was also linked to a growing awareness of anachronism and inaccuracy in history in general. In England Geoffrey of Monmouth's version of British history was questioned by historians including Vergil, Stow and Camden and by 1600, it had been widely rejected.²⁶³ The same impulses that led those with a scholarly interest in history to reject myth and anachronisms in written history are also likely to have driven antiquarians to search for accurate sources for historical imagery. In addition, the increased use of easel portraiture and portrait engraving throughout the period meant that by the last quarter of the sixteenth century people had become used to seeing veristic and accurate images of famous people. As such, it had become expected that painted portraits would resemble their subjects.

On the continent, Giovio was among the first to show a concern for authenticity. He went to great lengths to obtain likenesses and claimed only to include portraits in his collection for which he had found an authoritative source (preferably an image but sometimes a written description).²⁶⁴ Similar claims were made by the authors of printed portrait collections including Thevet, Fulvio and Vasari who all left empty frames besides the biographies of figures whose portraits they could not locate.²⁶⁵ Such claims were not always true, however. Eugene Dwyer has shown that in some cases where Thevet claimed to have found an authentic contemporary source he had in fact taken the image from another printed publication.²⁶⁶ But the fact that Thevet went to such effort to claim authenticity for his images indicates that there was credit to be gained from his audience through demonstrating meticulous research.

²⁶¹ Thomas Hill, *The contemplation of mankind containing a singuler discourse after the art of physiognomie* (London: William Seres, 1571), p. 1. Hill goes on to discuss in detail how the humours are reflected in the complexion (pp. 12-15).

²⁶² Stow, *The annales of England*, 1592, p. 236.

²⁶³ Kendrick, *British Antiquity*, pp. 78-133.

²⁶⁴ Haskell, *History and its Images*, pp. 44-45.

²⁶⁵ Ibid, p. 28; Gregory, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print*, p. 86.

²⁶⁶ Dwyer, 'André Thevet and Fulvio Orsini', pp. 473-78.

In England, by the last quarter of the sixteenth century antiquarian sources were being used in the development of both painted and printed portrait designs. The woodcuts in the T.T. series, for example, were clearly designed with the use of pre-existing sources. In the title to the work, it is stated that the ‘true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the kings of England’ were ‘Diligently collected by T.T.’. From Richard II onwards (with the exception of Edward V) the images are all based on types that were already in use among painters.²⁶⁷ The designs for the earlier portraits were probably developed specifically for this publication and appear to have been made using a variety of sources. The portrait of Edward III, for example, depicts the king with long, wavy hair and a beard, similar to that with which he is portrayed in the gilt copper effigy on his tomb at Westminster Abbey (c.1386) (figures 18-19).²⁶⁸

One particular example of the search for a true royal likeness demonstrates a trail of interesting reference and counter-reference. In Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, Henry III is described as being ‘well favored of face, with the lidde of on [*sic*] of his eyes comming downe, so as it almost covered the apple of the same eye’.²⁶⁹ Henry’s ‘faulty eyelid’ was first described in writing by the Dominican friar Nicholas Trevet (*d.* in or after 1334) and was also mentioned in the chronicle of William Rishanger (*d.* after 1312).²⁷⁰ It has been suggested that Henry’s drooping eyelid was caused by a condition called ptosis palpebralis.²⁷¹ In the T.T. series Henry III’s right eye appears to have a slightly malformed eyelid, a feature that is not present on his tomb effigy at Westminster Abbey (1291-93), although the hair, beard and costume on the tomb effigy correspond closely to the rest of the T.T. design (figure 20). In a painting based on the T.T. woodcut (from the NPG set of kings and queens, c.1597-1618) the drooping eyelid is more pronounced (figure 21).²⁷² Although this painting is inscribed with the name ‘EDVARDVS’, it is clear the design derives from this print.²⁷³ When the set entered the NPG collection in

²⁶⁷ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, v, pp. 160-73.

²⁶⁸ Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, p. 85; Stone, *Sculpture in Britain*, pp. 192-93, pl. 150.

²⁶⁹ Holinshed, *Chronicles* (1577), II, p. 783.

²⁷⁰ Paul Binski, ‘The Early Portrait: Verbal or Pictorial?’, *Europäische Kunst um 1300 XV Internationalen kongresses für Kunstgeschichte I*, ed. by Gerhard Schmidt, CIHA: Vienna, 4-10, Sept, 1983 (Vienna: Bohlau, 1986), 211-15 (p. 211).

²⁷¹ Binski, ‘The Early Portrait’, p. 211.

²⁷² NPG 4980(6). See Appendix 1, ix.

²⁷³ Analysis of the paint layers indicates the inscription is original (MATB database, forthcoming: NPG 4980(6)).

1974, the picture was identified as Edward II, probably because the three-dash decorative serif on the right side of the sitter's head was interpreted as the numeral 'II' (figure 23). However, similar decorative marks are also present on the portraits of Henry I, Stephen and John where they are used as punctuation marks after a word or digit (figure 24). It is probable, however, that the portrait was either intended to represent Henry III, in which case the inscription was applied erroneously, or Henry's son, Edward I, who is known to have inherited the ptosis palpebralis.

Henry III was also depicted with a drooping eyelid in Hendrick Goltzius's series of engravings (figure 22). Although the early portraits in the series are fictional, it is clear that someone with a degree of knowledge about English history and heraldry was involved in their design. The figures hold accurate shields and the insignia of the Order of the Garter are given only to the appropriate kings. In addition, there are a number of references to historical events. For example, William II is shown with an arrow in his chest and Richard III has a broken lance at his feet and is holding a broken sword, references to his defeat at Bosworth. As these references appear to have been added in part to identify the kings, it is probable that as a result of the popularity of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, it was relatively widely known that Henry III had a drooping eyelid. The connection between written works such as Holinshed and image series such as that compiled by T.T. is exemplified by an extant copy of T.T.'s book that is now in the collection of the BL.²⁷⁴ The book includes notes written by the antiquary and Keeper of the Tower Records, William Lambarde (1536-1601), the majority of which are extracts from Holinshed. For the first five kings and Edward II, Lambarde has copied relevant sections about the lives of the sitters next to the images, including the descriptions of their physical appearance. The book was printed with several blank pages before and after each portrait and seems to have been designed for this kind of use.

The woodcuts of Henry IV and Richard II in the T.T. series both relate to painted portrait types that were developed for sets in around 1580. The image of Richard II is ultimately derived from the full-length painting of the king dating from the 1390s that is

²⁷⁴ BL, Lansdowne MS 218.

now at Westminster Abbey (figure 25).²⁷⁵ There is evidence to suggest that although this painting was originally commissioned to hang in the Abbey, it may have been at Whitehall Palace in the late sixteenth century. The evidence comes from Lambarde's surviving papers among which is a record of a conversation that the antiquary had with Elizabeth I in 1601 during which she told him that Lumley had given her a portrait of Richard II that he had found 'fastened to the backside of a door of a base room'.²⁷⁶ Lumley certainly knew about the Westminster painting by the 1580s. In 1590 he not only owned a group (possibly a set) of portraits of kings and queens that commenced with Richard II, but he also owned a full-length portrait of the king bestowing a Writ of Parliament on Lumley's ancestor, Ralph Lumley, the first of the barony.²⁷⁷ The latter clearly derives from the Westminster portrait and was probably copied directly. The smaller portrait is not known to survive but it was almost certainly a version, perhaps the first version, of the only portrait type found in sets of kings and queens from the 1580s onwards, which is also derived from the fourteenth-century painting.²⁷⁸ Richard II's tomb effigy in Westminster Abbey corresponds closely to the smaller portrait type and it is possible that this source was also consulted in the development of the design (figure 26).

The portrait of Henry IV in the T.T. series is based on what Strong has termed the 'Standard False Portrait' of the king.²⁷⁹ The earliest known painted versions of the type, most of which are from sets, also date from the 1580s.²⁸⁰ The T.T. image is the earliest known version in print. The composition and costume was based on a woodcut portrait of Charles VI of France (1368-1422).²⁸¹ The half-length portrait of Charles was published in the *Recueil des effigies des roys de France avec un brief sommaire des genealogies faits et gestes d'iceux* (Lyon, 1567) and later in Bernardo Giunti's *Cronica*

²⁷⁵ On this portrait, see *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400*, ed. by Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1987), pp. 517-18, no. 713.

²⁷⁶ Jonathan Bate and Dora Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World* (London: BM, 2012), pp. 97-98.

²⁷⁷ 'The Inventory' in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, fols 38^r and 38^v.

²⁷⁸ For details of other versions of this portrait, see Vol. 2, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, pp. 6-128.

²⁷⁹ Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, p. 142.

²⁸⁰ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1 and Appendix 2, pp. 6-128. Two versions in the NPG collection have been dated by dendrochronology to the 1580s or later (NPG 310 and 4980(9)). See Vol. 2, Table 3 and Table 4.

²⁸¹ Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, pp. 142-43

Breve de i fatti illustri de Re di Francia (Venice, 1588) (figure 27).²⁸² The head was previously used for the medallion portrait of Charles in Guillaume Rouillé's *Promptuarii iconum insigniorum à seculo hominum, subiectis eorum vitis* (Lyon, 1553). In the half-length portrait, Charles is shown in a semi-profile position, facing to the left with a sceptre in his left hand and a falcon sitting on his right fist.²⁸³ Instead of a crown, the king wears a chaperon of a type that was fashionable in France and the Low Countries in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.²⁸⁴

In lieu of a life portrait of Henry IV or a source that could easily be adapted to fit the style of Elizabethan portraiture, it is probable that the portrait of Charles VI was chosen as a model because the French king was Henry's peer and contemporary (the two were born just a year apart). The medieval-style costume in the portrait, particularly the chaperon, is also likely to have appealed to antiquaries, as it would have given the image an element of authenticity. The design was not copied in full, however. In the T.T. woodcut the French king's falcon has been replaced by an orb and in some of the paintings he holds a Lancastrian red rose. The most obvious changes, however, have been made to the face. Whereas Charles is shown clean-shaven, Henry IV has been given a short beard and moustache, similar to that with which he is depicted in his tomb effigy at Canterbury Cathedral (figure 28).

The original painted version was almost certainly developed before the T.T. image. In almost all of the paintings, the king wears a distinctive gold chain with three lines of links replicating that worn by Charles VI in the earlier printed image. Most of the paintings also retain the pendant suspended from the chain including the three drop-pearls that hang from it, although in most cases it has been embellished with the image of a lion rampant. In contrast, the maker of the T.T. image has replaced the chain with a

²⁸² A copy of the 1567 book is in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France (Rare Books, 4-L37-6) and the BM has a complete set of the Giunti series (1871,0812.4381 to 4443). Giunti's family owned a printing press in Lyon. Strong records that the portrait was also printed in a work entitled *Cronique abrégé des rois de France* that was published in Lyon in 1555 (Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, pp. 142-43 and II, pl. 276).

²⁸³ The falcon may relate to a well-known story about Charles VI in Jean Froissart's chronicle in which the king fears, in a dream, that he has lost his prize hunting falcon until a flying stag appears and helps him retrieve it (Haldeen Braddy in 'Cambyuskan's Flying Horse and Charles VI's "Cerf Volant"', *Modern Language Review*, 33: 1 (1938), 41-44.)

²⁸⁴ Mary G. Houston, *Medieval Costume in England and France: The Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1939), pp. 169, 221.

ribbon and has decorated the pendant with jewels. Another similarity between the paintings and the French model is in the shape of the chaperon: in the portrait of Charles VI, the peak of the headdress on the sitter's proper left hand side is slightly higher than that on his right. This line is generally followed in the paintings but not in the T.T. woodcut in which both peaks are roughly the same height. Furthermore, in the woodcut version a crown has been placed on top of the chaperon, an addition that is not seen in the painted versions.²⁸⁵ The indication is, therefore, that Talbot based his design on pre-existing paintings rather than searching for another antiquarian source. The resulting woodcut served as the prototype for the images in John Taylor's 1618 series and the *Baziliologia*, which in turn provided the likenesses for a number of painted series.

The printed portraits of English kings and queens published by Walter Dight in c.1610-12 show the extent to which their portraits had become standardized by this point. Hendrick Goltzius's engravings provide the basic prototypes of Dight's full-length images but in many cases, including the portrait of Henry IV, Goltzius's fictional heads have been replaced by the more recognizable designs in the T.T. book.²⁸⁶ In some cases, the heads have become a hybrid of the two.²⁸⁷ It seems clear that the Goltzius images were no longer considered to be recognizable enough to represent English kings and queens. Goltzius's engravings of Henry VIII, Edward VI and Mary I, however, for whom he had used life portraits, were deemed acceptable and were therefore not changed. The fashion for portrait sets in print and paint had contributed greatly to the standardization of portrait types and as such, by 1610, people would have expected to see what they believed to be the 'true' likenesses of figures for which known portrait types existed.

The less widely reproduced portrait types sometimes failed to establish themselves, however. The design used by Talbot for Stephen's portrait, for example, was evidently rejected by Holland for the *Baziliologia*, perhaps because he felt the crude, rather comical forward-facing portrait did not fit the style of the engravings made by Renold Elstrack (1570-c.1625) and others. Only two paintings derived from the T.T. type

²⁸⁵ The only paintings that include this detail are those made after the engraving in the *Baziliologia* including the portrait in the DPG set, which was not made until 1618.

²⁸⁶ See Vol. 2, Appendix 6, vii, pp. 177-81.

²⁸⁷ The portrait of Henry III, for example, retains the Goltzius head but the beard and moustache from the T.T. woodcut has been added to the face.

survive which indicates that it was not widely copied.²⁸⁸ Instead, Holland chose to use an engraving of Stephen's contemporary, Roger II of Sicily (1095-1154) from Domenic Custos's *Regum Neapolitanorum vitæ et effigies* (Antwerp, 1605).²⁸⁹ Roger II was not only a contemporary but also a Norman conqueror and his depiction in armour was appropriate for Stephen whose reign was ravaged by civil war. Two other engravings from the Custos series were also used for the *Baziliologia*: a portrait of Manfred of Sicily (c.1232-1266) provided the prototype for the portrait of William I and a portrait of René I, duke of Anjou (1409-1480) was used to represent Richard I.²⁹⁰

The Use of Portrait Sets to Denote Antiquity

i. Family Histories

In the second half of the sixteenth century there was what Roy Strong has called a 'genealogical mania' in England.²⁹¹ Hereditary rights and privileges were the foundation on which Tudor society was built and an illustrious pedigree brought with it high social status, wealth and influence at court. Under Elizabeth, however, shifts within the social structure as a result of economic change and the queen's elevation of men from a relatively humble background, led to a general sense of anxiety among the aristocracy.²⁹² The old, established nobility felt threatened by the rise at court of men such as Burghley who was descended from minor nobility, and in turn the newly elevated were anxious to present themselves as worthy of their new-found status. The obsession with genealogy developed as a result; while the old nobility sought to remind others, and most importantly the monarch, of their prestigious lineage, the newly elevated and the socially aspirational commissioned research into their ancestry and acquired the visual symbols of an illustrious heritage.

²⁸⁸ One version is in the NPG set (4980(3)) and the other is in the collection at Arundel Castle, West Sussex (see Vol. 2, Appendix 2, 'Stephen', p. 70).

²⁸⁹ Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 48. The connection between the *Baziliologia* and this publication was noted by Vertue in 1732: George Vertue, *Vertue Note Books*, V, Walpole Society XXVI (Oxford: OUP, 1937-38), p. 103.

²⁹⁰ Another type, similar to the T.T. woodcut, was first used for William I but was rapidly replaced by this image.

²⁹¹ Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 47.

²⁹² For an overview of the social changes at this time, see Neil Cuddy, 'Dynasty and Display: Politics and Painting in England, 1530-1630' in *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630*, ed. by Karen Hearn. For more information see Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*.

These symbols included heraldic imagery, funeral monuments and, increasingly, portraiture. The importance of this outward display of lineage was reflected in a proclamation issued by the queen in 1560 against the destruction of non-superstitious monuments in churches and other public places. It was argued that through this iconoclasm, it was not only the buildings that were ‘spoyled, broken and ruined’, but also ‘the true understanding of divers families in this Realme (who have descended of the bloud of the same persons deceased)’ and as a consequence ‘the true course of theyr inheritaunce may be hereafter interrupted, contrary to Justice’.²⁹³ Families had long sought to safeguard their hereditary privileges through the display of heraldic devices and this kind of imagery continued to be employed throughout the period. At Lumley Castle, for example, eighteen coats of arms of Lumley’s ancestors adorned the doorway to the undercroft of the Great Hall in 1590.²⁹⁴ At Burghley, William Cecil’s Lincolnshire seat, the family’s arms and the arms of their ancestors were prominently displayed along the route through which important visitors would take to enter the house.²⁹⁵ In addition, houses were also decorated with the arms of friends, relations, business associates and other local families, which served not only to celebrate current alliances, but also to record historical connections and assert the importance of the family in the region. In the early 1580s, for example, Sir William Fairfax (1531-1597) had a series of 443 coats of arms of Yorkshire families painted in a frieze above the wainscot in the Great Chamber at Gilling Castle, North Yorkshire.²⁹⁶

Under Elizabeth and James, the display of illustrated genealogies was also relatively common. At Theobalds, Burghley’s pedigree was painted alongside images of kings and queens in the loggia overlooking the Great Garden.²⁹⁷ Conscious of his family’s relatively humble recent history, Burghley had commissioned genealogical research in an attempt to trace his bloodline to ancient Welsh princes and to highlight historical

²⁹³ England and Wales, Sovereign, *A Proclamation against breakinge or defacing of monumentes of antiquitie, beyng set up in churches or other publique places for memory and not for superstition* (London, 1560).

²⁹⁴ Anne Payne, ‘Heraldry and Genealogies’ in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, pp. 21-27 (p. 22).

²⁹⁵ Hesselby, ‘Architecture at Burghley House’, II, p. 201.

²⁹⁶ Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, p. 25.

²⁹⁷ Airs, ““Pomp or Glory””, p. 11.

connections to noble families.²⁹⁸ His claims regarding his ancestry, like those of many of his contemporaries, were highly questionable, but the proliferation of bogus or exaggerated genealogies demonstrates the importance of lineage at this time. As Laurence Stone has argued, ‘a lengthy pedigree was a useful weapon in the Tudor battle for status’.²⁹⁹ Pedigrees were produced in a variety of media but those displayed on walls were most commonly painted on vellum rolls. A surviving example that includes miniature portraits was made for the Hesketh family of Lancashire in c.1594.³⁰⁰

In the second half of the sixteenth century, portraiture was also being used to denote the antiquity of a family. Sets of ancestors, however, were surprisingly rare. The only known surviving example is Lumley’s series of fifteen full-length portraits painted on canvas. The series begins with a portrait of the semi-mythical Saxon nobleman Liulph, and originally ended with a portrait of Lumley himself, which is no longer with the set.³⁰¹ All fifteen portraits appear to have been produced in a single workshop and they were almost certainly commissioned as a set. On Lumley’s death in 1609 the set was hanging in the Great Chamber at Lumley Castle along with ‘a pillar of his pedigree’.³⁰² The set was echoed by a series of fourteen recumbant effigies, also commencing with Liulph, that were installed by Lumley along the north aisle of the church at Chester-le-Street in 1594-97.³⁰³ Lumley’s preoccupation with his lineage reflected both his antiquarian interests and his own social anxieties. As a Roman Catholic, he had reason to feel insecure: in 1537 his father had been executed for high treason for his part in the Pilgrimage of Grace and in 1571 Lumley had himself been imprisoned for his part in the Ridolfi Plot.³⁰⁴ Through allusions to his ancestry he no doubt hoped to secure a reputation for himself as a legitimate, loyal and worthy nobleman and to strengthen his once precarious social position.

²⁹⁸ Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 125.

²⁹⁹ Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, p. 23.

³⁰⁰ *Elizabeth I and Her People*, ed. by Tarnya Cooper (London: NPG), pp. 118-19, no. 36.

³⁰¹ Macleod, Cooper and Zoller have suggested that this may have been the full-length portrait of Lumley in armour attributed to Sir William Segar and dated 1588 that remains in the collection of the Earl of Scarborough (Macleod et al, ‘Appendix Three’, in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, pp. 157-64 (p. 157)).

³⁰² Hervey, ‘The Lumley Inventory’, p. 42.

³⁰³ Nigel Llewellyn and Claire Gapper, ‘The Funeral Monuments’ in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans, pp. 35-38 (pp. 36-37).

³⁰⁴ Barron, ‘The Collecting and Patronage of John, Lord Lumley’, pp. 125, 127.

Lumley had no surviving children to carry on his name but for others portraits of offspring represented the continuation of a family line. Again, however, family sets as a single commission also appear to have been relatively rare in this period possibly because paintings of individual family members were more often acquired as single objects over a number of years. The few surviving examples indicate that family sets may have been commissioned to mark a specific occasion, such as a marriage, or to signify an increase in fortunes. An important partially surviving example was painted in 1579/80 for the wealthy merchant Thomas Smith (1522-1591).³⁰⁵ The artist was the Dutchman Cornelis Ketel (1548-1616) who worked in England between 1573 and 1581. The set of bust portraits, eight of which survive, originally depicted Smith, his wife and their children, twelve of whom survived to adulthood. Each of the surviving portraits is inscribed with the date of 1579, and it is clear that they were made as a group.³⁰⁶ Another notable family group dates from around the second decade of the seventeenth century, the bulk of which survives at Deene Park in Northamptonshire.³⁰⁷ The majority of the figures represented are children although the set also includes a portrait of a woman and a nursemaid with a baby. The portraits are painted on panels each measuring 30 x 22 ½ inches (76 x 57 cm) and are set within a feigned oval with a gold border. The original provenance of the portraits is not known, but it has been suggested that the paintings may represent members of the Tresham or the Cockayne family.

³⁰⁵ Karen Hearn, 'Merchant-Class Portraiture in Tudor London: 'Customer' Smith's Commission, 1579/80' in *Treasures of the Royal Courts: Tudor, Stuarts and Russian Tsars*, ed. by Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2013), pp. 36-43.

³⁰⁶ Most of the portraits are privately owned. One is at the Yale Center for British Art in the Paul Mellon Collection (John Smythe of Ostenhanger, Kent, oil on panel, 18 ½ x 15 in. (47 x 38.1 cm) (B1973.1.14)).

³⁰⁷ Angela Cox is currently researching this set along with other family sets for her forthcoming doctoral thesis on 'Children in Portraits, c.1570-c.1640' (working title) (Birkbeck, University of London). Some of the information about this set presented here comes from a paper read by Cox at the NPG in November 2013 as part of a series of Staff Research Seminars. Other information is taken from notes in the HAL and the Photographic Survey at the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art. A portrait of a girl now in the Paul Mellon Collection at the Yale Center for British Art has also been identified as part of the set (B1973.1.57).

ii. Portraits of Local Heroes in a Domestic Setting

In the same way that some members of the nobility and gentry displayed the arms of local families, some patrons commissioned sets of local historical worthies to hang in their homes. In the county palatine of Cheshire, for example, portraits of the celebrated Norman earls of Chester and the barons of the Exchequer were made for more than one family. It was believed that the earldom of Chester had been granted to the first earl, Hugh d'Avranches (*d.*1101) by William the Conqueror. The earldom had not only brought with it a vast landed estate, but regional power comparable to that held by the king elsewhere in the country. From at least the first half of the twelfth century, Cheshire had its own fiscal court that was presided over by a group of barons of the Exchequer. Both the earls and the barons were integral to the historical narrative of Cheshire and an implied ancestral association with either would have brought prestige and a degree of local authority. In 1577 the first edition of Holinshed's *Chronicles* was published which included a section headed 'The true genealogie of the famous and most honorable earles of Chester' and listed the first seven earls by name.³⁰⁸

A set of the Norman earls of Chester survives at Chester Town Hall.³⁰⁹ It consists of eight full-length portraits on panel representing the first seven earls of Chester and Eadric Sylvestris (*d.*1089?), a Saxon landowner who led a rebellion in the region against William the Conqueror. The paintings, which are all inscribed with the date 1578, were painted for the Stanleys of Hooton Hall, Cheshire and were originally set into the wainscot in one of the rooms at the house.³¹⁰ In 1576 Sir Rowland Stanley (*c.*1516-1612) was made Sheriff of Chester and if the paintings were produced in 1578, they would have been acquired at the time Stanley held this office.³¹¹ The Stanleys no doubt hoped that the paintings would imply they were descendents of these local 'kings', a genealogical connection that would bolster the authority and status of the family in the county. Before Hooton, the family seat of the Stanleys had been Storeton in Lancashire

³⁰⁸ Holinshed, *Chronicles*, 1977, II, pp. 650-51.

³⁰⁹ See Vol. 2, Appendix 7, pp. 204-08.

³¹⁰ George Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester*, 3 vols (London: Lackington etc., 1819), II, p. 230. The set was subsequently purchased by Sir Thomas Gibbons Frost (1820-1904), Mayor of Chester, who presented it to the Town Hall in 1883. I am grateful to Peter Boughton for providing this information.

³¹¹ K.R. Wark, *Elizabethan Recusancy in Cheshire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971), p. 182.

and as Eadric Sylvestris was believed to have been an ancestor of the Sylvestors of Storeton, the inclusion of his portrait further associated the family with the history of the region.³¹²

Comparable sets are likely to have been produced for other local families. The Done family of Utkinton Hall, Cheshire are also known to have owned full-length portraits of the earls of Chester and eight portraits of the ancient barons of the Exchequer depicted on horseback.³¹³ It is not known when these paintings were made but by 1782 they had passed to the Arden family and were hanging in a town house owned by the Ardens near Stockport. In addition, in 1624 William Stanley, 6th Earl of Derby (c.1561-1642), a kinsman of the Stanleys of Hooton, owned a portrait set of the barons of the Exchequer that is likely to have been painted in the late sixteenth century.³¹⁴ Around the same time as the paintings were made for Hooton Hall, another knight in the region, Sir William Brereton, commissioned images of the first seven earls in stained glass for Brereton Hall, Cheshire.³¹⁵

iii. Royal Portrait Sets in a Domestic Setting

The display of royal portraits in a domestic setting was primarily intended to show loyalty to the reigning monarch, but royal imagery could also be used to refer to the history of a family. As Stone has noted, most high status families in England owed their social success to royal favour either under the present monarch or at some point in history.³¹⁶ Portraiture could be used to commemorate this patronage. It is significant, for example, that the only portrait of an English monarch recorded in the 1578 inventory of Kenninghall was Richard III. Richard had a personal significance for the Dukes of

³¹² On the history of the Stanleys of Hooton, see Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester*, pp. 228-31.

³¹³ John Watson, *Memoirs of the Ancient Earls of Warren and Surrey and Their Descendants to the Present Time*, 2 vols (Warrington, [n. pub.], 1782), II, p. 213; John Britton and Edward Wedlake Brayley, *The Beauties of England and Wales: Volume II* (London: Vernor, Hood & Shape etc., 1801) pp. 284-85; J.P. Earwaker, *East Cheshire: Past and Present, or A History of the Hundred of Macclesfield in the County Palatine of Chester from Original Records*, 2 vols (London: printed for the author, 1877), I, p. 480.

³¹⁴ Tittler, *Portraits, Painters and Publics*, pp. 34-35.

³¹⁵ Tim Thornton, *Cheshire and the Tudor State, 1480-1560* (Rochester, NY: Royal Historical Society, 2001), p. 44. The glass is now at Stoneleigh Abbey, Warwickshire and is dated 1577. It was part of a programme that also included the nine Saxon earls of Mercia.

³¹⁶ Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy*, pp. 191-92, 476-81.

Norfolk: the first and second dukes had both fought for the king at Bosworth Field in 1485 and it was Richard who had bestowed on John Howard, the first Duke, both his title and the hereditary office of Earl Marshal.³¹⁷ It is probable, therefore, that the painting was either a very early portrait of the king or a painting acquired at a later date to celebrate the family's history.³¹⁸ Royal portrait sets could also be used to refer to the history of a family. As we have seen, Lumley's royal portrait series began with Richard II, undoubtedly a conscious decision intended to highlight his family's connection to that king. For others, however, royal portrait sets did not point to specific examples of royal favour but were intended to give a general sense that their owner's ancestors had played a part in the historical narrative that the images served to represent.

The display of royal portrait sets also reflected a widespread interest in royal genealogy that was related in part to the uncertainty of the succession throughout the period. This interest was also expressed through the display of royal genealogies. Burghley displayed a pedigree of the kings of England at Theobalds and in 1596 there were two 'pedigrees of princes' at Longleat in Wiltshire.³¹⁹ The tactic of referring to a monarch's illustrious lineage was often deployed by those hoping to gain favour. In 1610 or 1611, for example, the antiquary Thomas Lyte (1568-1638) presented James VI and I with an illustrated genealogy based on Lyte's 1605 manuscript *Britaine's Monarchie*, which showed the king's descent from Brute and the Romans.³²⁰ The pen and ink roll included a portrait of James enthroned, and roundel portraits of many of his predecessors. The gesture paid off: Lyte was rewarded with the lavish gift of a miniature of the king set in

³¹⁷ David M. Head, 'Howard, Thomas, second duke of Norfolk (1443-1524)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn September 2012) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13939>> [accessed 2 April 2014]; Anne Crawford, 'Howard, John, first duke of Norfolk (d.1485)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13921>> [accessed 2 April 2014].

³¹⁸ A portrait of Richard of unknown date survives in the collection at Arundel Castle; the dimensions (22 x 17 in.) and style of painting indicate that it is an Elizabethan portrait.

³¹⁹ Paul Hentzner, *Travels in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth and Fragmenta Regalia* by R. Naunton (London: Cassell's National Library, 1889), p. 52; Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 53, fols 96^r and 98^v.

³²⁰ Thomas Lyte, *Britaine's Monarchie* (1605), BL Additional MS 59741; Bate and Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World*, pp. 208-09. The genealogy presented to James does not survive but an unfinished version of it made in c.1605 is at the British Library: Additional MS 48343.

gold and diamonds, now in the British Museum.³²¹ Royal portrait sets also served to flatter the monarch in a similar way.

Sets of kings and queens were also intended to demonstrate an understanding and acceptance of the royal bloodline. It is no surprise, therefore, that the consort most commonly represented in Elizabethan portrait sets was Anne Boleyn, Elizabeth's mother.³²² The other consorts found in royal sets were also figures who had played a vital genealogical role. A late sixteenth-century extant set at the Deanery in Ripon, North Yorkshire, for example, includes portraits of Elizabeth Woodville, Elizabeth of York, Katherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour, all of whom had given birth to an English monarch (Elizabeth Woodville had given birth to Elizabeth of York as well as Edward V).³²³ Of Henry VIII's six wives, only those who had contributed to the royal bloodline were included. Lady Margaret Beaufort, the mother of Henry VII and descendant of Edward III, is also represented in this set, which underlines its genealogical purpose. It is also notable that royal sets that were made in the 1580s and early 1590s seem to have most commonly commenced with a portrait Edward III, from whom the royal houses of Lancaster, York and Tudor were all descended.³²⁴

Around the turn of the century, however, royal portraits sets began to extend even further back. From around the 1590s there appears to have been a market for royal sets commencing with William the Conqueror. Surviving examples include the NPG set, made between 1597 and 1618, and the set formerly owned by Alleyn, made between 1618 and 1620. The medallion portrait series at Chichester Cathedral serves as a precedent for these sets, but there is no evidence to suggest that easel portrait sets began with William the Conqueror before the 1590s. The demand at this time is likely to have been due to the publication of printed portrait series including the T.T. woodcuts and the *Baziliologia*, both of which commenced with the Conqueror. These publications not only provided sources for the paintings but probably generated an interest in these earlier monarchs. There is no evidence that any sets were made in this period that went

³²¹ Bate and Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World*, pp. 208-09.

³²² See Vol. 2, Table 5.

³²³ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, iv, pp. 15-23.

³²⁴ Extant sets that began with Edward III include the Ripon set, a set now at Longleat House, Wiltshire and a set at Syon House, West London, all of which were probably made in the late sixteenth century. See Chapter 4 and Vol. 2, Appendix 1, pp. 6-65.

even further back. The Conquest was a convenient watershed, beyond which, as Daniel Woolf has put it, ‘lay a murky but penetrable historical space’.³²⁵ For some, there was more prestige to be gained from an association with the conquerors of England than with those whom they had conquered and it is perhaps for this reason that historical portrait sets rarely went beyond this point in history.³²⁶

Few painted sets commencing at the Conquest survive and there are only a handful of extant single portraits of the monarchs before Edward III, which may indicate that the demand for these longer sets was relatively small.³²⁷ There is some documentary evidence, however, to suggest that other sets beginning at the Conquest were produced. In 1598 a fly-boat master named William Love reported having seen ‘pictures of the Kings and queens that have been in England and Scotland from the Conquest’ in the abbey of St. Bertin’s, in St. Omer in the Low Countries (now northern France).³²⁸ Love was being questioned in Lisbon on suspicion of transporting English priests and Jesuits to St Omer and possibly travelling to Spain as part of a Roman Catholic plot. A Jesuit College had been established in St Omer in 1592 for the education of English and Scottish boys from Catholic families.³²⁹ Love reported that he had been shown the paintings by the Scottish abbot who also had a picture of Elizabeth I in his house. The portraits appear to have been a declaration of loyalty to the English Crown; when Edward Seymour, 1st Earl of Hertford (c.1539-1621) visited the college in 1604, he reported being ‘highly gratified with the patriotic ardour he witnessed there’.³³⁰ It is possible that the set may have been produced in England and sent over some time between 1592 and 1598, or made by local painters using patterns sourced from England. Another possible example may have been at Odell Castle in Bedfordshire. In about 1719, the antiquary George Vertue (1684-1756) saw there a painted set of ‘All the

³²⁵ Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 122.

³²⁶ Nigel Llewellyn has argued that a pre-Norman English ancestry was actually considered to be shameful by some (Nigel Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), p. 302).

³²⁷ See Vol. 2, Appendix 2, pp. 66-128.

³²⁸ SP 12/266, fol. 155^v.

³²⁹ Peter Guilday, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795, Vol. I: The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795* (London: Longmans, 1914), pp. 138-41.

³³⁰ *Ibid*, p. 141.

Kings of England from William the Conqueror', which might have been an Elizabethan or Jacobean series.³³¹

Despite the fact that the fashion for royal portrait sets was probably at its height in the later years of Elizabeth's reign, few surviving sets include a portrait of the queen (see Table 5). Most consumers of royal sets probably already owned a portrait of the queen and it may be for this reason that she was not included. Alternatively, it is possible that many sets did include portraits of Elizabeth but because of the enduring appeal of the queen, these paintings are more likely to have become detached from the rest of the group. I would like to argue here, however, that in some cases Elizabeth's image was either deliberately excluded from royal sets or destroyed at some point during her reign. It is well known that Elizabeth's councillors made a number of attempts to control her image.³³² In 1563, for example, a proclamation was drafted (but never published) that aimed to regulate the production of her image so that only an officially approved design could be used. In 1596 the Privy Council ordered all public officers to help destroy unseemly images of the queen, which were to her 'great offence'. It is probable, therefore, that portraits of the queen were left out of some sets made during Elizabeth's reign because of the fear of causing offence. Others may have been painted and then destroyed after the 1596 order. In his *History of the World* (1614), Sir Walter Raleigh (1554-1618) noted that 'Pictures of Queene Elizabeth, made by unskilfull and common Painters' were 'by her owne Commandment [...] knocke in peeces and cast into the fire'.³³³

Further evidence that images of the queen were destroyed in the 1590s comes from an heraldic manuscript now the BL. The manuscript is a copy of *The armor of nobiliti* written by Robert Cooke (d.1593), Clarenceux King of Arms, with additions and corrections by Robert Glover (1543/4-1599) and Thomas Lant (1554/5-1600/01).³³⁴ It was produced between 1589 and 1593, probably for Lumley, and includes the arms and a short biography of each monarch from William the Conqueror to Elizabeth I.³³⁵ The

³³¹ Vertue, *Vertue Note Books*, I, Wapole Society XVIII (1929-30) [hereafter 'Vertue I'], p. 59.

³³² Roy Strong, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), pp. 5-6.

³³³ Sir Walter Raleigh, *The history of the world* (London: Walter Burre, 1614), 'The Preface', B2^v.

³³⁴ BL Royal MS 18 C XVII.

³³⁵ Lumley's signature is on the manuscript.

relevant engravings from the Goltzius series have been coloured and pasted into the manuscript besides each biography.³³⁶ However, when it comes to Mary and Elizabeth, the original pages that would have held the portraits have been removed and the text has been re-written in a different hand on another page. In both cases, an identical note in a sixteenth-century hand records the reason: ‘This leafe followinge cutte out by reason of ye inconsiderate unseemlynes of ye picture drawn for her majestye by the graver and Paynter’.³³⁷ These images may have been removed in the late 1590s as a result of the Privy Council order, or possibly because the queen had raised an objection to the images of herself and Mary in this specific series. Painted portraits, especially those in sets that were generally painted rapidly and produced cheaply, may have been destroyed for the same reason.

iv. Civic and Institutional Histories

The tradition of demonstrating the antiquity of a town, city or institution through images of founders and benefactors pre-dates the Tudor period. Before the sixteenth century, representations of historical worthies were most commonly found in the form of statuary, monumental brasses, heraldic manuscripts and stained glass.³³⁸ Statues of founders or royal benefactors were erected on civic crosses and medieval town gates across the country from the thirteenth century onwards.³³⁹ In Gloucester, for example, statues of eight royal figures that had played a significant role in the history of the town adorned the High Cross, a civic monument that was probably erected in the fourteenth century.³⁴⁰ In London, a statue of the legendary founder of the city, King Lud, had been installed on Ludgate along with effigies of other kings, as early as 1260.³⁴¹ At the Cathedral Priory in Worcester, a series of stained glass windows were installed in the late fourteenth century that depicted the images of former benefactors from Anglo-

³³⁶ This must have been done at the time the manuscript was produced as the image is integrated into the page layout.

³³⁷ BL, Royal MS 18 C XVII, fols 177^v and 182^v.

³³⁸ Tittler, *The Face of the City*, pp. 19, 23-24.

³³⁹ Smith, *The Royal Image*, pp. 38-42, 101-3.

³⁴⁰ Ibid, pp. 40-42.

³⁴¹ Nicola Smith, ‘The Ludgate Statues’, *The Sculpture Journal*, 3 (1999), 14-25. The statues survived into the Tudor period and were replaced under Queen Elizabeth after the originals were mutilated by iconoclasts during the reign of Edward VI.

Saxon times onwards.³⁴² These images were intended to fulfil a commemorative purpose and were ostensibly signs of civic pride, but they were also designed to assert the importance of the town and to encourage further patronage.

By the late sixteenth century portrait sets of civic worthies were also starting to appear. For example, a group of twelve paintings of sixteenth-century benefactors to the city of Gloucester survive in the city's Folk Museum.³⁴³ The group may have originally been larger: eighteen portraits were recorded among the city's possessions in 1635/6.³⁴⁴ The portraits have been dated to between 1600 and 1618 on the basis of style and the fact that all of the sitters had died by 1617/18.³⁴⁵ Painted on oak panels, at least eleven of the surviving paintings appear to have been conceived as a series and were probably made at the same time or over a short period of time.³⁴⁶ Although the paintings vary in size, they have a similar palette of primarily yellow, brown, red and black and they have all been thinly painted in the same, rather crude style, as Robert Tittler has observed. The hands of four or five artists have been detected in the making of the group, but it is likely that they were produced in the same workshop, possibly as a single commission.³⁴⁷ There are no records of the acquisition of the Gloucester paintings, but they were probably commissioned by the civic authorities to hang in the building known as the Tolsey, which was in use for town business from the mid-fifteenth century.³⁴⁸

London's Livery companies also began to commission easel portraits in the second half of the sixteenth century and from the 1590s, a number of companies were

³⁴² Richard Marks, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 121.

³⁴³ Inventory numbers: GLRCM Art 016059, 016063-72, 016074. Brian Frith, *Twelve Portraits of Gloucester Benefactors* (Gloucester: City Museums and Art Gallery, 1972); Tittler, *Portraits, Painters and Publics*, pp. 166-69. See Vol. 2, Appendix 8, pp. 209-15.

³⁴⁴ Frith, *Twelve Portraits*, p. 7.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5

³⁴⁶ Tittler has suggested that the portrait of Thomas Bell (1486-1566), which is the only painting with a coat of arms, may not have been conceived as part of the group (Tittler, *Portraits, Painters and Publics*, p. 166).

³⁴⁷ Frith, *Twelve Portraits*, p. 5; Tittler, *Portraits, Painters and Publics*, p. 168.

³⁴⁸ The paintings hung in the Council Chamber of this building for many years before they were moved to the Guildhall in 1892 (Frith, *Twelve Portraits*, p. 7).

commissioning portraits in sets.³⁴⁹ Before this time, sets of illustrious members and benefactors had been made for the companies in other media. For example, a series of terracotta portrait heads of both former and current members were made for the Mercers' Company hall in 1567 and the Armourers' Company commissioned a series of members and benefactors in glass in 1573. By the 1590s, however, easel portrait sets of members and benefactors were also starting to appear. In 1596, the Haberdashers' Company commissioned a set of ten paintings of their leading benefactors. They were followed by the Vintners' Company who commissioned the painter Richard Greenbury to produce a group of portraits in 1623 of 'sundry aldermen benefactors to the this [*sic*] company who have borne the office of lord maiors'.³⁵⁰ By the early seventeenth century, the Barber-Surgeons' Company had portraits of their former masters in their hall, apparently depicted in one large 'table'.³⁵¹

v. Royal Sets in Civic Institutions

Civic institutions were keen to advertise their history for the same reasons that families sought to demonstrate their ancestry. 'Ancient' origins could denote authority, status and legitimacy and could encourage potential patronage.³⁵² In addition to commissioning portrait sets of members and benefactors to this end, civic institutions also displayed royal portraits to record specific moments of royal patronage. For example, a small group of portraits of founders and benefactors commissioned by Christ's Hospital Abingdon in 1607 included paintings of Edward IV and possibly Henry VI (figures 29 and 30).³⁵³ Both kings had played a significant role in the history

³⁴⁹ Archer, Ian W., 'The Arts and Acts of Memorialization of Early Modern London' in *Imagining Early Modern London. Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype 1598-1720*, ed. by J.F. Merritt (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 89-113 (pp. 97, 98). The examples given in this paragraph have all been identified by Archer. I have been unable to find further examples in the surviving records.

³⁵⁰ GL MS 15201/2, p. 329; Richard Greenbury was based in London but also carried out some work in Oxford (Tittler, *The Face of the City*, p. 38).

³⁵¹ Ibid, pp. 155-56 and Sidney Young, *Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1890), pp. 509-10.

³⁵² The word 'ancient' was used frequently to mean old or historical (Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 46 and Ian Anders Gadd, 'Early Modern Printed Histories of the London Livery Companies' in *Guilds, Society and Economy in London 1450-1800*, ed. by Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2002) pp. 29-50 (p. 32)).

³⁵³ Arthur E. Preston, *Christ's Hospital Abingdon: The Almshouses, the Hall and the Portraits*, 2nd edn (Oxford: OUP, 1930), pp. 37, 55. The portrait identified by Preston as Henry VI more

of the charitable institution: in 1441 Henry VI had granted the Letters Patent for the incorporation of the Fraternity of the Holy Cross, the organization responsible for building some of the almshouses owned by the Hospital, and in 1553 Edward VI had granted the Hospital a royal charter. The portraits were probably supplied by the Oxford-based painter Sampson Strong (c.1550-1611), along with a number of other portraits of founders and benefactors, to decorate the hall following a period of rebuilding. The commemoration of a royal charter through portraiture had a precedent in the great painting produced by Hans Holbein the Younger (1497/8-1543) for the Barber-Surgeons' Company in the early 1540s.³⁵⁴ The painting, which depicted the king and eighteen members of the company, was commissioned to celebrate the charter granted in 1540 that confirmed the union between the Company of Barbers and the Guild or Fellowship of Surgeons.

In 1602 the Merchant Taylors' Company embarked on a series of improvements to their company hall that included the acquisition of a royal portrait set for a newly added room known as the King's Chamber.³⁵⁵ The room was completely refurbished and a new wainscot interior was installed into which the portraits were presumably set.³⁵⁶ Details of the work, which began in September and continued until July the following year, were recorded in a set of surviving building accounts.³⁵⁷ Included in these accounts are a series of payments to the painters Richard Jacks and Edmond Merony for '24 kings, henry the seventhes, 2 nobell men, the Maste^r & 4 Wardens, hope & charity & the companies armes'.³⁵⁸ The payments were made in five instalments between 18 April and 18 June 1603. Given the size of the commission, it is probable that Jacks and Merony were each responsible for several painters who were employed to execute the work. The fact that Henry VII's portrait is referred to separately in the accounts suggests that it may have been larger than the other portraits of kings or made using

closely resembles contemporary portraits of Henry VII but it is possible that this, or another painting now lost, was intended to represent the earlier king.

³⁵⁴ On this painting see Susan Foister, *Holbein and England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2005), pp. 65-67.

³⁵⁵ C.M. Clode, *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist, in the City of London*, (London: Harrison, 1875), p. 36. The decision to redecorate the room was recorded in the Count Minutes on 12 July 1602: GL MS 34010/4. I am grateful to Edward Town for originally drawing my attention to the reference.

³⁵⁶ Neither the paintings nor the room survive.

³⁵⁷ GL MS 34048/8.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid*, fol 41.

more expensive materials. A century earlier, in 1502, Henry had granted the company its royal charter from which it had attained its full privileges and it is probable that the refurbishment of the hall was timed to celebrate this anniversary.³⁵⁹

We cannot be certain about the identities of the other twenty-four kings that were painted for the Merchant Taylors in 1603, but it is likely that they represented English monarchs from at least Edward I, the king who had granted the company its original licence in 1299/1300. Royal charters had subsequently been granted to the company by Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV and Edward IV. In addition, all English kings from Richard II to Henry VII (excluding Edward V) had been honorary members of the company. The portraits were painted for the hall just after the death of Elizabeth I; the choice of decoration may therefore have been influenced by hopes that the new king would visit and support the company. The Master and Wardens also commissioned the Sergeant Painter, John de Critz the Elder (c.1552-1642) to provide paintings of Elizabeth I, James VI and I, Anne of Denmark and Prince Henry Frederick in 1603.³⁶⁰ In 1607 James visited the hall and dined in the King's Chamber.³⁶¹ He was presented with a vellum roll listing illustrious members and benefactors of the company (including the former monarchs who had been honorary members), which had been compiled by the Common Clerk of the company, Richard Langley, from the company's archival records. Ian Anders Gadd has suggested that this type of historical research, which seems to have been undertaken by livery companies more frequently from the late 1590s onwards, may have been stimulated by the publication of John Stow's *Survey of London* in 1598.³⁶²

As well as referring to its own past, a set of royal portraits could give an institution a sense of authority by associating it with the history of the nation. It is probably for this reason that a series of statues of kings and queens was chosen to decorate the exterior walls of London's Royal Exchange. The Exchange was founded by Sir Thomas Gresham (c.1518-1579) and was modelled on the bourse at Antwerp where Gresham

³⁵⁹ For the history of the company, see Clode, *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*.

³⁶⁰ Edward Town, "'Whilst he had his perfect sight'" – new information on John de Critz the Elder', *Burlington Magazine*, 165: 1312 (2012), 482-86 (p. 483).

³⁶¹ Clode, *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors*, pp. 147-60.

³⁶² Gadd, 'Early Modern Printed Histories', p. 29.

has spent much time as a royal agent.³⁶³ Although the statues were not produced until after his death, the series was envisioned by Gresham who had thirty niches installed into the first floor facade of the quadrangle to house the planned representations of Edward the Confessor, King Harold and the kings and queens from William I to Elizabeth.³⁶⁴ In the end, the statues were produced over a number of years in the early seventeenth century.³⁶⁵ The majority were destroyed by the Great Fire of London in 1666 but an engraving by Wenceslas Hollar made in 1644 records the arrangement (figure 31).³⁶⁶ The statues are also visible in an engraving by Frans Hogenburg that was made in 1568-69, but it is thought that this view depicted the proposed scheme rather than the decoration as it was at that time (figure 32).³⁶⁷

vi. The History of an Office or Profession

Portrait sets depicting predecessors in a particular office or profession were occasionally made to commemorate the illustrious ‘genealogy’ of the role. A set of this kind was made to celebrate the history of the office of Constable of Queenborough Castle on the Isle of Sheppey in Kent in the late 1590s.³⁶⁸ The set was almost certainly commissioned by Sir Edward Hoby (1560-1617) after he became Constable in 1597. It depicted nineteen of his predecessors beginning with John Foxley, who was made Constable by Edward III in 1362, and ended with his own portrait. Only a handful of the paintings survive and there are no known documentary records of their acquisition, but it is likely that they were commissioned by Hoby to hang in the hall at Queenborough. There is evidence to suggest that the design of each painting was informed by Hoby’s research into the life of each sitter and the history of the Castle, and that some of the paintings were based on antiquarian sources that were located by him.

Hoby’s connection to the set was recorded by the apothecary Thomas Johnson (c.1595-1644) whose book *Iter plantarum investigationis ergo susceptum* (1629) contains the

³⁶³ On the history of the Royal Exchange, see *The Royal Exchange*, ed. by Ann Saunders (London: Guardian Royal Exchange, 1991).

³⁶⁴ Katharine Gibson, “‘The Kingdom’s Marble Chronicle’: The Embellishment of the First and Second Buildings, 1600 to 1690”, in *The Royal Exchange*, ed. by Saunders, pp. 138-173.

³⁶⁵ Ibid, pp. 139-40.

³⁶⁶ Ibid, p. 144. The statue of Elizabeth I survives at the Guildhall, London.

³⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 139.

³⁶⁸ See Vol. 2, Appendix 9, pp. 216-22.

earliest-known written reference to the paintings. On his travels in Kent in 1629, Johnson saw the portrait of Hoby in the home of a man called Skelton, the minister of the church in Gillingham. The reference is worth quoting in full:

*Nec præterire possum hospitalitatem (more patrio) ab Ecclesiæ Pastore D. Skelton nobis oblatam & acceptam; In cuius etiam domo invenimus vividam effigiem, patrûm memoriâ, virtute, bonarumq; literarum studio clarissimi Equitus D. Edwardi Hobæi, cum hac inscriptione, Sparsa & neglecta coegi. In unum enim magno & sumptu & labore nomina, insignia gentilitia, & vivas (quoad fieri potuit) imagines omnium Castelli Quinborow Conestablium (sic nos eius loci præfectum nominamus) coegit, & ultimo loco propriam posuit, quæ omnia temporum & sordidorum hominum injuria dispersa sunt.*³⁶⁹

I cannot omit to mention the hospitality offered to us and received (in the manner of his father) by the minister of the Church D. [doctor?] Skelton. For in his house we found a lively portrait of Sir D. Edward Hoby, most renowned in the memory of our forebears for his virtue and his study of [or enthusiasm for] good things [goods/objects?] and literature, with this inscription: *I have gathered together scattered and neglected things*. For with great expense and effort he collected the names, coats of arms, genealogies and, as far as he was able, the lifelike portraits of the Constables of Queenborough Castle (for thus we call the person in charge of that place), and finally he added his own. All of which have been scattered through the ill effects of time and uncultured men.³⁷⁰

Written only a little over thirty years after the paintings are likely to have been made, the account is probably relatively reliable, although it appears to have been based largely on Skelton's oral testimony. However, the inscription on the portrait of Hoby is telling; not only does it indicate that the portrait of Hoby was intended to be displayed along with the paintings of his predecessors (the 'scattered and neglected things' presumably refer to the historical and antiquarian sources that Hoby located and consulted in devising the set and it would therefore only have made sense as part of the group), but it also highlights the connection between painted portrait sets and antiquarianism.

Johnson's reference, which was cited in John Harris's *History of Kent* (1719) (a source that was used by Walpole in his *Anecdotes of Painting*) has led to some confusion about

³⁶⁹ Thomas Johnson, *Iter plantarum investigationis ergo susceptum a decem sociis, in agrum cantianum anno. Dom. 1629 Julii. 13* (London(?): A. Mathewes, 1629), [not paginated, A4^r(?)].

³⁷⁰ I am grateful to Nicholas Daunt for this translation.

this set, which I hope to dispel here.³⁷¹ Some have misinterpreted the reference and assumed that Hoby collected pre-existing paintings of his predecessors rather than the antiquarian sources needed to devise the set.³⁷² It is clear from the surviving paintings, however, that the portraits were produced together in the late sixteenth century and there is a general consensus among art historians that they were painted for Hoby.³⁷³ But the date that Hoby commissioned the paintings has also been a matter of some confusion. In his book, Johnson also gave a description of the hall at Queenborough Castle, which he had visited (a description that was also cited by Harris in 1719).³⁷⁴ According to him, the arms of the nobility and gentry of Kent were placed around the top of the room with the arms of Elizabeth I at their centre with Latin verses beneath celebrating the queen. The scheme was dated 1593. Neither Johnson nor Harris connected the portraits to the heraldic display although it is probable that they were made to hang in the same space at a slightly later date. Despite this, however, Johnson's description of the hall and his account of the paintings appear to have become conflated in some more recent references to the set. Waterhouse has stated, for example, that the portraits were painted for Hoby in 1593 and that the paintings were 'centred round a portrait of Queen Elizabeth'.³⁷⁵ But there is no evidence that there was a portrait of Elizabeth included in the display at the hall – Johnson's description mentions only her arms – and there is no suggestion in any of the literature that the paintings were produced at the same time as the arms and the Latin verses. Hoby only became Constable on 9 July 1597 and, although he had a connection to the Castle before this time (he was MP for Queenborough in 1584 and 1586), it is unlikely that he would have commissioned the paintings before he held the office himself.³⁷⁶

³⁷¹ John Harris, *The History of Kent* (London: Midwinter, 1719), pp. 376-77; Horace Walpole, *Anecdotes of Painting: Volume 1*, 3rd edn (London: Dodsley, 1782), p. 101.

³⁷² The writer of an anonymous letter about the paintings printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1786 stated that they had been 'collected, and placed' in the castle (Anon, *Gentleman's Magazine*, 56: 1 (1786), 5-6) and Hoby's *ODNB* entry also says that he collected the portraits (Louis A. Knafla, 'Hoby, Sir Edward (1560–1617)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13410>> [accessed 20 July 2014]).

³⁷³ Walpole concluded that they were 'in all probability painted from the best memorials then extant' (Walpole, *Anecdotes*, p. 101); Waterhouse, *Painting in Britain*, p. 40; Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 86.

³⁷⁴ Johnson, *Iter plantarum*, [A4^v(?)]; Harris, *The History of Kent*, p. 376.

³⁷⁵ Waterhouse, *Painting in Britain*, p. 40. Tudor-Craig appears to have been misled by this error and has previously stated that the set was produced between 1593 and 1597 (Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 86).

³⁷⁶ Knafla, 'Hoby, Sir Edward' (online).

For many years the paintings were erroneously attributed to Lucas Cornelisz de Kock (1495-1552) due to an observation made by Vertue who noticed a monogram on the portrait of Thomas Arundel (1353-1414) that read 'LCP', which he interpreted as 'Lucas Cornellis pinxit'.³⁷⁷ This attribution was repeated by Walpole and again by S.H. Steinberg in the *Burlington Magazine* in 1939 who concluded, as a result, that the set must have been commissioned by Sir Thomas Cheyne (c.1485-1558) who was Constable from 1511/12 to 1559 (despite the fact that the attribution to Cornelisz had been rejected by Lionel Cust in 1909).³⁷⁸ Steinberg argued that the portraits of Hoby and Sir Robert Constable (d.1591) must have been added at a later date. The attribution is now accepted as being incorrect, however, and the identity of the painter, or painters, remains unknown.

As Johnson's reference to the set indicates, the portraits were no longer at Queenborough Castle by 1629 and the portrait of Hoby had become detached from the rest. At some point in the seventeenth century, the majority of the paintings entered the collection of the Kent MP Sir John Tufton (1623-1685) and were included in the London sale of possessions in 1686.³⁷⁹ Sixteen of the paintings were at Penshurst Place in Kent by 1728, when they were seen there by Vertue.³⁸⁰ It is possible that they were acquired for Penshurst from Tufton's sale. Vertue described the portraits as all being life-sized 'half-bodies' on panel and listed the sitters by name. The portraits of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster (1340-1399), Sir Anthony Browne (c.1500-1548), Francis Cheyne (d.1512) and Hoby were not with the group at this time. The portrait of John of Gaunt had entered the collection of the Dukes of Beaufort at Badminton House,

³⁷⁷ Vertue, *Vertue Note Books*, II, Walpole Society XX (1931-32) [hereafter 'Vertue II'], p. 51.

³⁷⁸ Walpole, *Anecdotes*, p. 101; S.H. Steinberg, 'A Portrait of George, Duke of Clarence', *Burlington Magazine*, 74: 430 (1939), 35-36; Lionel Cust, with C.F. Bell, *Illustrated Catalogue of Early English Portraiture* (London: Chiswick Press for the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1909), pp. 49-50.

³⁷⁹ Tufton's collection was sold at the King's Arms Tavern in the Strand, London in May 1686. The sale was advertised in the London Gazette on 20 May. Portraits of 'all the Constables of Quinborough Castle, rarely Painted, by an ancient Hand' were reportedly among the paintings. See 'Sale of the collection of Sir John Tufton at the King's Arms Tavern in the Strand, 25 May 1686' in University of York, 'The art world in Britain 1660 to 1735,'

<<http://artworld.york.ac.uk>> [accessed 16 August 2014].

³⁸⁰ 'Vertue II', pp. 51-52.

Gloucestershire by 1752, where it remains, but the other three portraits cannot be traced.³⁸¹

When Walpole visited Penshurst in 1752 he saw all sixteen portraits but noted that six of the set were only heads.³⁸² In 1728 Vertue had observed that some of the paintings were much decayed and it is possible that six of them had been cut down in the intervening years in an effort to preserve them.³⁸³ By 1939, however, only two of the paintings remained at Penshurst.³⁸⁴ Some are known to have entered other collections (for example, the portrait of George, Duke of Clarence (1449-1478) was in the collection of the Marquess of Hastings by 1866) but others may have been destroyed. Walpole noted that the picture of Sir John Cornwall, Constable under Henry IV, had been given away to a Mr Velters Cornwall and this portrait was still in the Cornwall family collection in 1939.³⁸⁵ The portraits of Christopher Colyns, (Constable under Richard III) and William Scrope, Earl of Wiltshire (c.1351-1399) were later owned by the Collins family and the Scrope family respectively so it is possible that they, too, were given away to descendants.³⁸⁶

Some information about the appearance of the set can be gleaned from the surviving paintings and those for which we have recent information. They all appear to have been painted in oil on panel and to have measured around 44 x 35 inches (111.8 x 88.9 cm). There seems to have been some variation in terms of the composition, however, which

³⁸¹ The portrait of John of Gaunt was seen by John Loveday at Badminton in 1752 (Sarah Markham, *John Loveday of Caversham, 1711-1789: The Life and Tours of an Eighteenth-Century Onlooker* (Salisbury: Russell, 1984), p. 481).

³⁸² Walpole did not specify which six, but the portraits of Thomas Arundel, Humphrey Stafford, Thomas Wentworth and John Foxley were among the larger ten paintings (*The Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. by J. Wright, 6 vols (London: Bentley, 1840), II, p. 443). In addition to the four discounted by Walpole, we know that the portraits of William Scrope, George, Duke of Clarence and Christopher Colyns were not heads and can not have been cut down while at Penshurst (see Vol. 2, Appendix 9, pp. 216-22).

³⁸³ 'Vertue II', p. 52; Vertue, *Vertue Note Books*, VI, Walpole Society XXX (1948-50) [hereafter 'Vertue VI'], p. 27.

³⁸⁴ Those representing Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury and Sir Thomas Wentworth (Steinberg, 'A Portrait of George, Duke of Clarence'). Both of these paintings are still at Penshurst.

³⁸⁵ Walpole, *Anecdotes*, p. 101; Steinberg, 'A Portrait of George, Duke of Clarence', p. 36.

³⁸⁶ The portrait of Colyns was in the possession of a C.T. Collins Trelawny in 1867 and a George Collins of Ham, Devon in 1806 (Anon, *Gentleman's Magazine*, 56: 1 (1786), pp. 5-6) and the portrait of Scrope appears to have been in the possession of Simon Conyers Scrope at Danby Hall, Yorkshire by 1899 (John Henry Metcalf, *A Great Historic Peerage: The Earldom of Wiltes* (London: Chiswick Press, 1899), plate 3).

no doubt reflects the fact that they were based on different types of antiquarian sources. Three of the extant portraits (those representing John of Gaunt; William Scrope and George, Duke of Clarence) are of a similar format. They are all three-quarter lengths, in which the subject is standing. An inscription in the top right corner (from recto) of each painting records the date that the sitter was made Constable and each painting has a coat of arms in the top left corner. In contrast, the portrait of John Foxley (which is not known to survive but was described by Vertue) depicted the sitter kneeling and receiving a royal patent from King Edward III.³⁸⁷ The portrait of Thomas Arundel (who was Archbishop of Canterbury between 1396 and 1397 and Constable from 1408) depicts him with an open book and a gilt cushion before him and a mitre and crozier in the background. Vertue described this portrait as being 'like Bp Warham' and it is probable that the composition was influenced by the portrait of Warham painted by Holbein in 1527 in which the sitter also has a book and cushion before him and a mitre and crozier in the background.³⁸⁸ The portrait of Christopher Colyns (Constable in 1485) appears to have been quite unlike the others. An engraving of it was published in the *Gentleman's Magazine* in 1806 which shows that Colyns was depicted to his waist, standing under the entrance arch of the castle (not pictured to scale) and flanked by two other officials, possibly sergents-at-arms.³⁸⁹ Above him, two small figures were depicted in windows of the castle (one of whom was wearing a crown) and a battle was taking place on the roof.³⁹⁰ The imagery presumably refers to a specific event at the castle during Colyn's tenure as Constable. The differences in composition serve only to highlight the function of the set as a visual history of the castle and a record of the

³⁸⁷ 'Vertue II', p. 51. This appears to have led some art historians to assume that the series began with a separate painting of Edward III and a portrait of Edward at The Queen's College, Oxford which shows Queenborough Castle in the background has been linked to the set (Waterhouse, *Painting in Britain*, p. 40; Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, p. 85 and Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 86). It is possible that the portrait at The Queen's College was copied from the image of Edward in the portrait of Foxley, but it seems unlikely that the set would have begun with a portrait of the king and then also include him in the image of the first constable. In addition, the portrait of Edward is smaller than the rest of the surviving paintings (30 x 23 ½ in. (76 x 60 cm)) and has an inscription in a different style. It is notable, however, that this is the same type as the woodcut in the T.T. series (published the year Hoby became Constable) rather than the more usual painted portrait type.

³⁸⁸ For a description of the painting, see Committee of Council on Education, Science and Art, *Catalogue of the first special exhibition of national portraits ending with the reign of James II on loan to the South Kensington Museum, April 1866*, revised edn (London, 1866), p. 3, no. 11. 'Vertue II', p. 51. The portrait of Warham is at the Musée du Louvre, Paris (INV. 1344).

³⁸⁹ D.H., *Gentleman's Magazine*, 76: 1 (1806), p. 417, plate 2.

³⁹⁰ Vertue gave a short description of the painting in 1728 that corresponds with the engraving published in 1806 ('Vertue II', p. 52).

individual constables. For each painting it seems that Hoby went to some effort to include information about the life of the sitter whether that was through their arms, their costume or the addition of extra narrative material.

Hoby's set of predecessors was very much about the history and 'lineage' of the office. Other 'professional' sets focused less on a specific office and more on the profession in general. For example, a set of at least ten portraits depicting judges was made in c.1619 for the lawyer Sir Thomas Chamberlain (*d.*1625), probably to hang in his Oxfordshire residence, Northbrook House near Kirtlington.³⁹¹ Although the house has been demolished, the paintings survive in a private collection. The set includes an image of Chamberlain who was Chief Justice of Chester from 1616 and became a judge of the Court of the King's Bench in 1620. The other figures depicted were all high-ranking judges that were either still practising in 1619 or who were recently deceased.³⁹² The half-length portraits were painted in oils on wooden panels that are now rectangular but which originally had arched-tops. Tarnya Cooper has suggested that the set may have been designed to hang in niches in the upper recesses of the hall at Northbrook.³⁹³ The display celebrated Chamberlain's own professional achievements by associating him with other illustrious lawyers. In addition, Cooper has argued that as Chamberlain is known to have actually held a court at Northbrook in 1625, the paintings may also have been intended to create 'an impressive statement of the collective power of the law'.³⁹⁴

Conclusions

This chapter has shown that portrait sets were used by individuals, families and institutions as a way of reminding (or persuading) others of a particular historical narrative. In Tudor and Jacobean England authority and status was largely determined by the age of a family or institution. An illustrious and lengthy lineage brought certain privileges and a degree of security in an uncertain time. Portrait sets were one of a number of devices used by both families and institutions to display their lineage and to

³⁹¹ Cooper, *Citizen Portraits*, pp. 132-34.

³⁹² In addition to Chamberlain, the figures depicted are: Sir Christopher Wray (c.1522-1592); Sir David Williams (1550-1613); Sir John Denham (1559-1629); Sir Henry Hobart (c.1554-1625); Sir Thomas Foster (1548-1612); Sir Peter Warburton (c.1540-1621) and Thomas Egerton (1540-1617), Lord Ellesmere.

³⁹³ Cooper, *Citizen Portraits*, p. 132.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

allude to their early foundations. Bespoke sets of ancestors, local heroes or institutional worthies were sometimes commissioned to this end but sets of English kings and queens could also imply a connection to the nation's history. As patrons competed to prove themselves to be the most 'ancient', portrait sets of kings and queens began to extend further back in time, reaching the Conquest by the late 1590s. In the next chapter I will look at this fashion for royal sets in the late sixteenth century and examine the motivations of some of those who acquired them.

Chapter 4

Elizabethan and Jacobean Royal Sets

As the examples given in the previous chapters have shown, sets of portraits of royal figures could be used to communicate loyalty, legitimacy, authority and status. They were sometimes commissioned ahead of a royal visit in order to flatter the monarch and elsewhere they were acquired for didactic or moralizing reasons. The value of the royal series had long been understood in England and images of kings and queens were a recurrent theme in the country's visual culture. Tudor and Jacobean patrons would have been familiar, for example, with the statues of kings at Westminster Palace and the royal cycles in glass at Canterbury Cathedral (1396-1411) and All Soul's College, Oxford.³⁹⁵ Kings and queens continued to be represented in a variety of media in addition to easel portraits throughout the sixteenth century, which attests to both the conventionality of the subject and the recognized value of the royal series. Between 1515 and 1525, for example, half-length images of England's rulers from Brute to Henry VII were painted on the wooden ceiling of the Great Hall at Kirkoswald Castle in Cumberland for Thomas Dacre, 2nd Baron Dacre of Gilsland (1467-1525).³⁹⁶ In 1520 Thomas, Baron Darcy (*d.*1537) owned a hanging depicting the 'story of kings and queens' and in 1577 William Lovelace owned ten painted cloths depicting 'divers emperors and kings'.³⁹⁷

Portable sets of paintings of kings and queens may have first been made for pageants and ceremonies. Painted images of kings and queens adorned the Standard in Cheapside for both Anne Boleyn's entry into London in 1533 and for the coronation entry of

³⁹⁵ On the Canterbury windows, see *Age of Chivalry*, ed. by Alexander and Binski, p. 539. On the scheme at All Soul's, which included kings, archbishops, saints and the four doctors of the church, see F.E. Hutchinson, *Medieval Glass at All Soul's College: a history and description based on the notes of G.M. Rushforth* (London: Faber and Faber, 1949).

³⁹⁶ Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting*, I, pp. 159-59; Emily Chappell, 'New light on the "Little Men" of Naworth Castle' in *Late Gothic England: Art and Display*, ed. by Richard Marks (Donington: Shaun Tyas; London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 2007), pp. 70-81 (pp. 72-76). The ceiling was removed to Naworth Castle, Cumberland in 1622 but was destroyed by fire in 1844. The scheme may have been inspired by late medieval painted ceilings such as the extant example at St Mary's Church in Beverley, North Yorkshire (1445) that includes images of kings from Brute to Henry VI (Smith, *The Royal Image*, p. 12).

³⁹⁷ TNA SP 1/21, fol. 67; Foister, 'Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century Inventories', p. 278.

Elizabeth I in 1559.³⁹⁸ An observer of the latter event described the paintings as depicting ‘all the kings and queens chronologically in their royal robes down to her present Majesty’, which suggests that the images included recognizable portraits, possibly similar to those found in later easel portrait sets.³⁹⁹ Genealogical imagery depicting a royal figure’s illustrious descent was commonly included in the pageants designed for royal entries across Europe in the late-medieval period and it is probable that chronologically arranged paintings of kings and queens at Elizabeth’s entry evolved from this tradition. Previously, imagery relating to a ruler’s lineage had often been presented at pageants in the form of a genealogical tree but because of the association of this format with religious iconography, specifically the Tree of Jesse, a linear portrait series may have been considered more appropriate for Elizabeth’s coronation.⁴⁰⁰ However, as I have shown in Chapter 1, the evidence from surviving paintings and inventories indicates that the fashion for sets of easel portraits of kings and queens did not develop until later in Elizabeth’s reign. In this chapter I intend to demonstrate that a significant market for royal sets existed in England between 1580 and 1620. To this end, I will discuss the chief extant examples of English royal sets from this period and other royal sets known from documentary sources, all of which are detailed in Table 5.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁸ Stow, *The annales of England*, 1592, p. 953; Il Schifanoia to the Castellano of Mantua, 23 January 1559, ‘Venice: January 1559, 16-31’, *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 7: 1558-1580*, ed. by Rawdon Brown and G. Cavendish Bentinck (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1890), pp. 10-20, no. 10 < <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=94937> > [accessed 1 June 2014].

³⁹⁹ The observer was Aloisio Schivenoglia, a Mantuan known as ‘Il Schifanoia’ (see note 398).

⁴⁰⁰ Earlier royal pageants had included both painted genealogical trees and trees with actors representing the figures. At the entry of Mary I and Philip II into London in 1554 the pageants included a genealogy showing their joint descent from Edward III (Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969), p. 334). Gordon Kipling has argued that the Roman Catholic connotations of genealogical trees meant that they were used less in England after the Reformation (Gordon Kipling, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), pp. 63-65).

⁴⁰¹ I have named the group after its original location or owner where this is known with some certainty. Where this is not certain, I have named the set after the collection it is now part of. In the case of the ‘Cornwallis’ set I have named the group after a probable previous owner to differentiate it from other royal paintings in the Royal Collection.

The Royal Sets

Theobalds, Hertfordshire (1580s?)

Some aspects of the decoration at Theobalds, Burghley's great Hertfordshire mansion, have been discussed in the previous chapters but I will focus here on a group of English royal paintings that were seen at the house by Baron Waldstein in 1600.⁴⁰² The group included portraits of Richard III, Henry IV, Edward IV, Henry V, Henry VI and Henry VII (listed in that order). Waldstein did not name the room in which he saw the royal portraits but it is generally accepted that it was the 'Great Gallery', a long gallery measuring around 123 x 21 feet that was situated on the first floor of the west range of the Conduit Court.⁴⁰³ The Great Gallery was built between 1572 and 1585, although the room only received its chimneypiece in 1591.⁴⁰⁴ As well as the royal portraits, the marble busts and the 'coloured portraits' of the twelve Roman emperors were displayed there as were paintings depicting of cities of the world and a group of portraits representing key figures in the contemporary Wars of Religion (listed by Waldstein as 'Don John of Austria, the Duke of Parma, Count d'Egmont, the Admiral of France, the Prince of Condé and the Duke of Saxony'). A description of the Duke of Württemberg's visit to the house in 1592 reveals that aspects of the decoration seen by Waldstein were certainly in place by this point, notably the series of paintings of world cities.⁴⁰⁵ Although the royal portraits are not mentioned in this account, it is probable that they had already been installed as part of this wider decorative scheme. The royal group, therefore, was probably commissioned specifically for this space in the 1580s.

On Burghley's death in 1598, the house passed to his son, Robert Cecil, and in 1607 it became a royal palace after Cecil (by then 1st Earl of Salisbury) gave it to King James in exchange for seventeen manors including the royal palace of Hatfield, some nine miles away.⁴⁰⁶ At this point, some of the paintings at Theobalds remained at the Palace and

⁴⁰² *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 85.

⁴⁰³ Summerson, 'The Building of Theobalds', p. 124; Airs, '“Pomp or Glory”', p. 12. I am grateful to Emily Cole for her guidance regarding the layout of Theobalds.

⁴⁰⁴ Summerson, 'The Building of Theobalds', p. 114.

⁴⁰⁵ William Brenchley Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London: Smith, 1865), p. 43.

⁴⁰⁶ After the exchange, Robert Cecil dismantled the old Hatfield Palace and built a new house on the site (Lawrence Stone, 'The Building of Hatfield House, 1607-1612', *Archaeological*

some remained in the Cecil collection and were later displayed at Hatfield. Among the paintings that survive in the collection at Hatfield are portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III, all three of which were recorded in an inventory of the house taken in 1612.⁴⁰⁷ It has been argued that these portraits are identical with those seen by Waldstein at Theobalds in 1600.⁴⁰⁸ However, there is evidence to suggest that the portraits of kings remained in the Great Gallery at Theobalds after 1607. A surviving account of the 1613 visit to the royal place of Theobalds by the Duke of Saxe-Weimar reveals that much of the decoration in the Great Gallery was still intact at this time including the portraits of the continental figures and the depictions of cities.⁴⁰⁹ ‘Portraits of all the Kings of England’ were also listed in the account and while we cannot be certain that these paintings were identical with Burghley’s group, it is probable that as the rest of the decoration had remained intact, the royal portraits were also still there. It may be the case that Burghley’s relatively small set had been enlarged by paintings from the royal collections. It is worth noting that there was also a set of half-length portraits of ‘all the Turkish Emperors’ and portraits of ‘Queen Elizabeth, together with many other Queens of England’ recorded at Theobalds in 1613, which could also have been brought to the house by the king.⁴¹⁰

Although the Hatfield portraits of Henry VI and Richard III are similar, the portrait of Henry V is quite distinct and appears not to have been produced with the other two.⁴¹¹ The portraits of Henry VI and Richard III both have a red brocade background and

Journal, 112 (1965), 100-28 and Claire Gapper, John Newman and Annabel Ricketts, ‘Hatfield: A House for a Lord Treasurer’ in *Patronage, Culture and Power*, ed. by Croft, pp. 67-95).

⁴⁰⁷ The portraits were probably also among the seven unnamed English kings recorded along with two queens in the lobby between the gallery and the chapel on the first floor of the west range in 1611 (Auerbach and Adams, *Paintings and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, p. 20). On the Hatfield inventories, see Susan Bracken, ‘Robert Cecil as Art Collector’ in *Patronage, Culture and Power*, ed. by Croft, pp. 121-137. For more on the surviving portraits, see Auerbach and Adams, pp. 28, 30-32, nos. 1, 3 and 5 and Vol. 2, Appendix 1, ii, pp. 10-12.

⁴⁰⁸ *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 84 and Bracken, ‘Robert Cecil as Art Collector’, p. 128.

⁴⁰⁹ Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, p. 163. By this time some of the portraits formerly in the Great Gallery appear to have been moved to the Privy Gallery, a long gallery on the second floor. Portraits of Don John of Austria, the Prince of Condé, the Duke of Parma and the Count of Egmont were again recorded as being at the palace in 1640 when it was visited by Signor de Mandelslo (*The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, trans. and ed. by Groos, p. 84). The portraits of continental leaders were sold from Theobalds in 1653 after the house was seized by parliamentary troops (Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures*, p. xxxiv).

⁴¹⁰ Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, p. 163.

⁴¹¹ I am grateful to the Marquess of Salisbury for allowing me to examine these paintings.

similar gilt spandrels to the Royal Collection prototypes discussed in chapter 1. The spandrels on the portrait of Henry VI contain the arms of England and France and those on the Richard III portrait, a pair of ‘antique’ profile heads, features copied from the Royal Collection paintings in both cases but not found on all later derivatives. Although the Hatfield paintings are slightly wider than those in the Royal Collection, the portraits themselves are the same scale and traced patterns of the prototypes appear to have been used. When a melinex tracing of the Royal Collection Richard III was placed over the Hatfield version, it was found to match almost exactly.⁴¹² Although tracings of the portraits of Henry VI have not been compared, the two paintings appear to have a similarly close connection. The portrait of Henry V, in contrast, does not compare as closely to the prototype.⁴¹³ In the Hatfield version the king has a wider body and more angular facial features and the painting has a plain dark-blue-coloured background. Although the relatively poor condition of the painting and the extensive retouching should be taken into consideration, the differences indicate that the portrait was not derived directly from the Royal Collection picture but from a pattern or painting at some remove from the original. The portrait is also slightly smaller than the other two Hatfield paintings, which may indicate that it did not come from the same source.⁴¹⁴

It is probable that the portraits of Henry VI and Richard III at Hatfield were similar to those at Theobalds, if not actually the same paintings. The portraits have not been examined by dendrochronology but they bear close comparison to others known to date from around the 1580s. For example, the portrait of Richard III is very closely related to a painting now at the NPG, which also matches the tracing of the Royal Collection picture almost exactly and which has been dated by dendrochronology to 1577 or later.⁴¹⁵ Although technical comparison between the Hatfield and NPG paintings is hindered by the fact that the Hatfield picture has been transferred from panel to canvas (probably in the twentieth century in an effort to conserve the painted surface), the

⁴¹² The tracing had to be shifted slightly for the costume and hands to align which may indicate that two patterns were used in the making of this painting, one for the head and one for the costume, or that a single pattern was used but shifted during the transfer process. The Royal Collection tracing was taken by Nicola Christie and the Hatfield tracing by Sally Marriott. Sally Marriott and I carried out the comparison together in 2010.

⁴¹³ Auerbach and Adams, *Painting and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, p. 29, no. 1.

⁴¹⁴ At 21 x 16 inches (53.4 x 42 cm) it is around 1-2 inches shorter and around 2 inches narrower than the other Hatfield paintings.

⁴¹⁵ NPG 148 (see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, iii, pp. 13-14 and Table 3). A tracing of the NPG portrait was taken by Sally Marriott with whom I compared it to the Royal Collection picture in 2010.

portraits appear have been painted in a similar way: both have a grey underlayer beneath the flesh paint and the modelling in the face of each sitter is comparable.

Like those at Hatfield (and probably Theobalds), the NPG picture of Richard III is known to have belonged to a set that included portraits of Henry V and Henry VI (and probably others, now lost).⁴¹⁶ This set is now dispersed but a link between the NPG portrait of Richard III and a portrait of Henry VI now at the Leathersellers' Company, London was identified through dendrochronology in 2011 and I have subsequently been able to add a surviving portrait of Henry V to the group.⁴¹⁷ The portrait of Henry V is now at Stanford Hall, Leicestershire and, although it has not been examined by a dendochronologist, it can be argued with some certainty that all three paintings were produced as part of the same set. Originally, all three had distinctive floriated spandrels painted in lead-tin yellow that were created using a stencil. At an early stage in the history of the portraits, possibly even before the paintings left the artist's studio, the floral decoration was covered over by gilt spandrels similar to those on the Royal Collection pictures. In 1972 the gilt spandrels were removed from the portrait of Richard III because it was believed they were a modern addition but they remain in place on the other two portraits although sections of the floriated design can be seen below.⁴¹⁸ The portraits of Henry VI and Richard III in this group are very close to the surviving paintings at Hatfield and the portrait of Henry V is also closely related to the Royal Collection prototype. It is probable, therefore, that, like the paintings at Hatfield and Theobalds, this group was made for a high status collector using the prototypes at Whitehall. As dendrochronology has indicated that the group was made in around 1580, it is likely that those at Hatfield (and those at Theobalds) were also made around the same time.

As the Queen's chief minister, Burghley would have been able to gain easy access to Elizabeth's portrait collection and as Theobalds was situated close to London in Hertfordshire, he could easily have drawn on the skills and resources of London painters to provide copies. He is also likely to have had copies made for his other residences and it is likely that he also acquired the paintings now at Hatfield in the last

⁴¹⁶ The group is referred to in Appendix 1 as the 'Floriated Spandrel Set'.

⁴¹⁷ On the Leathersellers' picture, see Farrell, 'Tree Rings Reveal Secrets of Royal Portraits'. I am grateful to Alan Bradford for allowing me to view this portrait in his studio.

⁴¹⁸ HAL, NPG 148 files; MATB database (forthcoming).

quarter of the sixteenth century. The royal portraits at Theobalds were part of a carefully constructed decorative scheme that presented Burghley as both a nobleman and an important statesman. The images of cities of the world and the protagonists of the Wars of Religion in the Great Gallery demonstrated not only that he was knowledgeable about the wider world but also that he was himself involved in international politics. In the Green Gallery at Theobalds, Burghley's role at the centre of domestic politics was also displayed through a series of fifty-two painted trees representing English counties, with the coats of arms of the relevant noblemen and knights painted in each.⁴¹⁹ The kings in the Great Gallery were probably intended to represent the conflict of the fifteenth century and its resolution with the arrival of Henry VII. The group began with Henry IV, whose usurpation of Richard II was traditionally believed to have begun the civil conflict, and ended with Henry VII.⁴²⁰ As advisor to the queen, it was partly Burghley's role to ensure that, learning the lessons from history, he did not allow her to make the mistakes of her predecessors.

Theobalds was held in high regard by contemporaries and had a significant influence on architecture in England.⁴²¹ By the 1590s Theobalds had become part of the tourist route followed by wealthy foreign visitors. In addition to the Duke of Württemberg in 1592, Baron Waldstein in 1600 and the Duke of Saxe-Weimar in 1613, the house was visited by a Silesian nobleman in 1597, Philip Julius, Duke of Pomerania-Wolgast in 1602 and Justus Zinzerling, a Thuringia native and Doctor of Laws at Basle in c.1610.⁴²² The state apartments were also accessible to domestic visitors; in 1599, for example, the English lawyer, Sir Roger Wilbraham (1553-1616) viewed the house and noted down

⁴¹⁹ Airs, "Pomp or Glory", pp. 11-12.

⁴²⁰ Perhaps because of the order in which the kings were listed by Waldstein (with Richard III first), Airs has stated that the group began with a portrait of Richard II (Airs, "Pomp or Glory", p. 12). It is more likely, however, that Richard III would have been included, not least because of the survival of the version at Hatfield, but also because otherwise there would have been a gap in the sequence.

⁴²¹ Summerson, 'The Building of Theobalds', pp. 125-26; Airs "Pomp and Glory", pp. 2-19 and Coope, 'The "Long Gallery"', p. 52.

⁴²² Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, p. 43 (Württemberg), p. 135 (Zingerling), p. 163 (Saxe-Weimar); Hentzner, *Travels in England*, p. 52 (Hentzner, a German lawyer, was accompanying the Silesian nobleman as his tutor); Gottfried von Bülow and Wilfred Powell, *Diary of the Journal of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania, through England in the Year 1602*, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s., 6 (1892), pp. 1-67.

details of the architecture and the decoration in his diary.⁴²³ The relatively open access to Theobalds means that the decoration within it is likely to have had a significant impact on English fashions as well as the architecture. The royal portrait group is likely to have inspired others to commission sets of their own and the Theobalds paintings may even have been accessible to painters for copying and the making of patterns. Given the influence and fame of the house, it is perhaps not too great a leap to suggest that Burghley's set at Theobalds, along with a handful of contemporary examples (including that owned by Lord Lumley discussed below), gave rise to the fashion for English royal portrait sets between the years 1580 and 1620.

The Lumley Collection (before 1590)

Lumley's royal portraits have been discussed in previous chapters but I intend to argue here that the group recorded in the 1590 inventory can only have been partially composed of portraits produced as a set. Lumley had many royal portraits in his collection in 1590 but Table 5 includes only those 'of a Smaller Scantlinge' (i.e. not full-lengths) that were listed together apparently as a group. The group included portraits of all the English monarchs from Richard II to Elizabeth I (there were two portraits of the reigning queen), with the exception of Edward V, plus Elizabeth of York and Prince Arthur (listed in chronological order).⁴²⁴ Elsewhere in the inventory, small portraits of Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort, Katherine of Aragon, Jane Seymour were also recorded but as these were listed separately from the main royal group (unlike Elizabeth of York) it is probable that they were not considered part of the main series.⁴²⁵

Only the portraits of Edward VI, Mary I and one of the portraits of Elizabeth I are known to survive and it is clear that none of these paintings belonged to a set.⁴²⁶ The

⁴²³ *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, For the Years 1593-1616: Together with Notes in Another Hand, For the Years, 1642-1649*, ed. by Harold Spencer Scott (London: Royal Historical Society, 1902), pp. 23-24.

⁴²⁴ 'The Inventory', fol. 38^v in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans and MacLeod et al, 'Appendix Three', p. 159.

⁴²⁵ The queens were listed with other royal women including Mary Queen of Scots (1542-1587); Isabella of Portugal (1503-3159), the wife of the Emperor Charles V and the 'Duchesse of Savoye' ('The Inventory', fol. 39^v in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans).

⁴²⁶ The current locations of these portraits are given by MacLeod et al in 'Appendix Three', p. 159.

portrait of Edward VI, which is attributed to Holbein, depicts him as a young child and was probably produced during his lifetime.⁴²⁷ It is unlike the usual type used for Elizabethan sets, which shows him around the age he became king and is based on a portrait by William Scrots (active 1537-53).⁴²⁸ The portrait of Mary was described in the inventory as being ‘drawne by Garlicke’ and has been attributed to Gerlach Flicke (active 1545-58), although it is based on the 1554 portrait of the queen by Anthonis Mor (1516-1575/76). It is now in the collection of Durham Cathedral Library and is painted on a round panel. Finally, the surviving portrait of Elizabeth, now at Westminster School, London, was dated in the inventory to the thirtieth year of her reign (i.e. c.1588). The other portrait of Elizabeth listed with the group was made, we are told, ‘as she was comyng first to the Crowne’. Both the portraits of Elizabeth and those of Edward VI and Mary I, therefore, appear to have entered the collection at different times and the varying format of these surviving paintings show that they were not made as part of a uniform group.

Some of Lumley’s paintings were inherited from the Earl of Arundel’s collection at Nonsuch and it is probable that the paintings of Edward VI, Mary and the earliest Elizabeth were among them. Lumley may also have inherited other portraits in the royal group including, for example, the portraits of Henry VII and Elizabeth of York, which may have been a pair produced in the first half of the sixteenth century. However, it is likely that the earlier kings represented in Lumley’s group were commissioned by him in a small set, to extend his royal series backwards in time. No easel paintings of Richard II and Henry IV are known to survive from before around 1580 so it is likely that Lumley commissioned his portraits of these kings around this time. Indeed, as I have suggested in Chapter 3, Lumley’s connection with the Westminster Abbey painting from which the portrait of Richard II derives may indicate that the type was first developed for him. Lumley may have commissioned the portraits of the other early kings (Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III) at the same time and it is likely that these paintings were based on the prototypes in the Royal Collection.

⁴²⁷ The portrait was sold to a private collector from the Weiss Gallery, London in 1998.

⁴²⁸ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, pp. 6-65 for other versions.

Ripon Deanery, North Yorkshire (c.1585-1600)

A surviving set of seventeen kings and queens now in the collection of the Dean and Chapter of Ripon Cathedral provides an important insight into the appearance of late-Elizabethan royal portrait sets.⁴²⁹ The set, which now hangs in the Dining Room at Minster House, comprises seventeen portraits on panel depicting English sovereigns from Edward III to Mary I, excluding Edward V but including Elizabeth Woodville, Elizabeth of York, Lady Margaret Beaufort, Katherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn and Jane Seymour.⁴³⁰ We can be relatively certain that all seventeen portraits were produced together as a series. A very similar style has been used across the set and the paintings are all approximately the same size (c.17 x c.23 inches (c.43 x c.58 cm)).⁴³¹ Furthermore, similarity in the panel construction and the quality of the wood across the set makes it likely that the panels were produced as a wholesale commission. Each panel is made from two vertically aligned boards and they have all been bevelled slightly on all edges (to a lesser extent at the sides).⁴³² The high incidence of knots in the wood and the waviness of the grain seen on all of the panels indicates that the wood used is either English oak or poor quality Baltic oak.⁴³³ The panels are all set into painted black wooden frames with a simple moulding that appear to be contemporaneous with the set (with the exception of later replicas on the portraits of Henry V, Edward IV and Edward VI, presumably made to replace damaged originals). The original provenance of the paintings is not known for certain but as far as it can be

⁴²⁹ I am grateful to the late Very Reverend Keith Jukes, Dean of Ripon, Ian Horsford, Gail Squires and Judith Bustard for their assistance. For more information see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, iv, pp. 15-23.

⁴³⁰ In addition to the portraits to be discussed here, there is a second group of royal portraits in the Library of Ripon Minster, which might have come from the same collection as the set. The second group includes portraits of Richard II, Henry IV, Elizabeth Woodville, Elizabeth of York, Anne Boleyn, Mary I and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. With the exception of the portrait of Leicester, the paintings in the second group are inferior in quality to the main set and were probably produced at a later date.

⁴³¹ The portraits of Henry V and Richard III are slightly narrower than the rest. For dimensions, see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, iv, pp. 15-23.

⁴³² I am grateful to Sally Marriott for her assistance with the technical examination of these paintings. Typically, panels used for this type of painting were made from two or three boards although occasionally single boards were used and more unusually, more than three boards were used.

⁴³³ The panels have not been analysed by a dendrochronologist so this has not been confirmed but it is based on my observation of other panels studied at the NPG as part of the MATB project.

ascertained, the paintings all have a shared history and probably came from the same source.

Despite the similarities between the paintings, the set does not appear to be the work of a single artist. Some of the portraits, including those representing Edward III and Richard III, have been painted very quickly with less attention to detail than others in the group, such as the portraits of Edward IV, Edward VI, Jane Seymour and Henry VIII. The portraits of Edward IV, Edward VI and Jane Seymour have some similarities to each other, particularly in the handling of the flesh paint, and it is therefore likely that the same person produced them. The ermine on the portraits of Richard III and Elizabeth of York is rendered in a very different way to that on the portraits of Edward III and Richard II which may indicate two distinct hands although it is important to bear in mind that the differences in the types of prototypes used for these portraits is likely to have resulted in notable aesthetic differences across the group. However, it is probable that a number of painters would have been employed to work on this type of commission. Evidence gathered from technical analysis on the NPG set (detailed below) indicates that many artists could have been involved in the production of a single set. It is therefore to be expected that different styles might be found across a set. Overall, however, the paintings in the set have a similar look to each other that is distinct from other extant royal sets and it is probable that they were produced in a single workshop. Apart from the portraits of Richard II and Henry VIII, the sitters' faces are slightly smaller in scale to most sets of this type, although the panels are a comparable size to other groups. Very little underdrawing can be seen on the surface of these paintings (unlike those in the NPG set) which may indicate that they were copied from other paintings rather than made using a traced cartoon, which would account for the slight difference in scale.

Although the provenance of the Ripon set is uncertain, there are some clues to its origin. The paintings are known to have been in the collection of the Deanery since at least 1828 although the exact date they were acquired is unknown. The evidence that they were in the collection before 1828 comes from the antiquarian papers of the local man John Tuting (1785-1865) who noted that Dean Darley Waddilove (1736-1828) had

identified some of the sitters in the set.⁴³⁴ According to Tuting, at the time that Waddilove compiled his list of the sitters, some of the paintings (including portraits of Richard II, Katherine of Aragon, 'Anna' and Anne Boleyn) were hanging in the Library in the Minster but at the time of writing (c.1860) they were in the Deanery.⁴³⁵ They were recorded as hanging in the entrance hall of the Deanery in 1901 and again in 1919.⁴³⁶ During the Second World War they were stored in the North West Tower of the Cathedral but otherwise they have remained at the Deanery ever since.⁴³⁷

A note in Tuting's papers records that the portraits had been given to the Deanery by Sir Edward Blackett of Newby Hall, a manor house around four miles from Ripon.⁴³⁸ Tuting provided no further evidence for this and it is the only known documentary reference to the original location of the set, so the veracity of the statement remains uncertain, but, as I will argue below, the circumstantial evidence makes it likely that the set did indeed come from Newby. Sir Edward Blackett, 2nd Baronet (1649-1718) was a landowner and MP for Ripon in 1689. He purchased the Newby estate in 1677 and in 1695 dismantled the existing manor house and built a new house on the site.⁴³⁹ If Tuting was correct, it is likely that Blackett donated the portraits to the Dean between these two dates.⁴⁴⁰ In which case, the fact that he gave the portraits away suggests that he acquired

⁴³⁴ John Tuting, *Miscellaneous Notes and Cuttings on the History of Ripon* (unpublished manuscript, University of Leeds, Brotherton Library, Ripon Cathedral MS 58, c.1824-65), fol. 7^v (modern pencil foliation); Kirsty Hallett, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', *The Friends of Ripon Cathedral Annual Report* (May 2003), 10-13 (p. 11). The inscriptions on the paintings were presumably concealed by dirt or may have degraded to the point that they could not be read. All of the inscriptions have been reinforced at some stage.

⁴³⁵ At this stage the pictures now in the Library at the Minster and the paintings in the Deanery set were mixed.

⁴³⁶ Cecil Hallett, *The Cathedral Church of Ripon: A Short History of the Church and a Description of its Fabric* (London, Bell, 1901), p. 133; Charles Harry Moody, *Handbook to Ripon Cathedral* (Ripon: Harker, 1919), p. 44.

⁴³⁷ Hallett, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', p. 11. A letter written by the daughters of a former Dean (F.D. Hughes) in response to Kirsty Hallett's article about the portraits confirmed that the paintings had been returned to the Deanery by the mid-1950s at the latest (*The Friends of Ripon Cathedral Annual Report*, May 2004, 13-14).

⁴³⁸ Ripon Cathedral MS 58, fol. 7^v; Hallett, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', p. 12.

⁴³⁹ P.A. Bolton and Paula Watson, 'BLACKETT, Sir Edward, 2nd Bt. (1649-1718), of Newby, Yorks. in *HPO* <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/blackett-sir-edward-1649-1718>> [accessed 23 January 2014]. For biographical information see Mark Blackett-Ord, 'Blackett, Sir William, first baronet (1621-1680)', *ODNB* (OUP, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61542>> [accessed 5 January 2014].

⁴⁴⁰ Blackett's son was also called Edward (Edward Blackett (1683-1756), 3rd Baronet) but the former's remodelling of Newby makes him the more likely of the two to have donated the portraits. As Kirsty Hallett has pointed out, a detailed record of the Deanery's financial

them along with the property in 1677. It is possible, therefore, that paintings were originally acquired for old Newby Hall. If so (taking into account the likely date of the paintings, discussed below), their probable first owner was William Robinson (1534-1616), a wealthy Yorkshire merchant who held a series of high offices in the 1580s and 1590s including Lord Mayor of York (1581-82 and 1594-95) and MP for the city (1584 and 1589).⁴⁴¹ In 1586 Robinson purchased the Newby estate from Sir John Dawnay and it may have been around this time that he procured the portrait set as fashionable decoration for his new property.⁴⁴²

It has previously been assumed that the Ripon set was made at the same time as another panel painting hanging at the Deanery, depicting James VI and I, Anne of Denmark and Prince Henry in a group in a single panel. For this reason, the set has been dated to the early seventeenth century.⁴⁴³ Although the group painting may have come to the Deanery from the same collection as the set, there is no evidence to suggest that it was made at the same time as the other portraits. Painted on a much larger panel made from horizontally aligned boards almost certainly from a graphic source, the family group is more crudely painted than the portraits in the set. Kirsty Hallett has suggested that its production could have been connected to the royal charter that Ripon received from the king in 1604.⁴⁴⁴ The portrait set, however, is likely to have been made at earlier date. Comparable versions of the portraits of Henry IV, Elizabeth of York and Anne Boleyn in the NPG collection have all been dated by dendrochronology to the late sixteenth century (see Table 3). In addition, unlike the portraits in some later sets, none of the Ripon portraits are based on prints from either the T.T. series (1597) or the *Baziliologia*

incomings and outgoings between 1711 and 1750, kept by the then dean, Heneage Dering (1665-1750), does not include any references to the paintings, although the receipt of other gifts are recorded, making it unlikely that the portraits were donated by the 3rd Baronet after his father's death in 1718 (Heneage Dering, *Diary and Account Book* (unpublished manuscript, University of Leeds, Brotherton Library, Ripon Cathedral MS 44, 1712-50); Hallett, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', p. 12).

⁴⁴¹ For biographical information on William Robinson, see N.M.S., 'ROBINSON, William II (1534-1616), of York.', *HPO* <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/robinson-william-ii-1534-1616>> [accessed 23 January 2014].

⁴⁴² Robinson resided primarily in York and owned a number of other properties including manors at Rawcliffe (acquired 1582) and Clifton (acquired 1606), so it is also possible that the portraits were acquired for another residence and moved to Newby at a later date. For details of the properties owned by the family at this time, see York City Archives MS ACC M31.

⁴⁴³ Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 94.

⁴⁴⁴ Hallett, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', p. 10.

(1618), which may indicate that the set pre-dates both these publications.⁴⁴⁵ Taking this into consideration, the presence of both Edward III and Henry IV in the set (the standard painted portraits for whom appear to have been developed in around 1580) indicates that the set was probably produced between 1580 and 1600. The style of painting, construction of the panels and use of gold leaf across the set is entirely consistent with paintings produced in the 1590s. The possibility that the set was produced for William Robinson of Newby Hall therefore gives us a conjectural production date of c.1585-1600.

Longleat House, Wiltshire (c.1585-1600)

The royal portrait set now in the collection of the Marquess of Bath at Longleat House, Wiltshire was acquired by Thomas Thynne, 1st Viscount Weymouth (c.1640-1714) from Cobham Hall, Kent in 1704.⁴⁴⁶ The paintings were listed in the Wardrobe of Pictures in an inventory of Cobham Hall taken in 1672 on the death of Charles Stuart, the last Duke of Lennox and Richmond.⁴⁴⁷ The duke left the hall to his widow, Frances, for life and the remainder of the estate to his sister, Katherine O'Brien, Baroness Clifton (1640-1702), wife of Henry O'Brien, Lord Ibrackan (c.1642-1678).⁴⁴⁸ In 1678, however, the dowager duchess sold her interest in the house and its contents to Lady Katherine's second husband, Sir Joseph Williamson (1633-1701). The portraits remained at Cobham Hall until they were sold to Lord Weymouth in 1704. When Lady Katherine died in 1702 the estate passed into the possession of her daughter, Katherine O'Brien (1673-1706) and her daughter's husband Edward Hyde, Viscount Cornbury (1661-1723). In 1704 the royal portraits were with Cornbury's father, Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of Clarendon (1638-1709), perhaps because Cornbury was overseas serving as Governor of the royal colonies of New York and New Jersey.⁴⁴⁹ On 1 June that year the

⁴⁴⁵ For the sources of the Ripon paintings, see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, iv, pp. 15-23.

⁴⁴⁶ I am grateful to the Marquess of Bath and Kate Harris for allowing me to view the paintings. For more information see Vol. 2, Appendix 1, v, pp. 24-27.

⁴⁴⁷ W.A. Scott Robertson, 'Furniture and Pictures at Cobham Hall in 1672', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 17 (1887), 392-408 (p. 404).

⁴⁴⁸ On the ownership of Cobham Hall see Ralph Arnold, *Cobham Hall, Kent: Notes on the House, its Owners, the Gardens and Park and Objects of Special Interest* (Cobham [n. pub., 1967(?)]), pp. 11-15 and Robertson, 'Furniture and Pictures at Cobham Hall', pp. 392-93.

⁴⁴⁹ Patricia U. Bonomi, 'Hyde, Edward, third earl of Clarendon (1661-1723)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41053>> [accessed 4 February 2014].

portrait painter Thomas Robinson (died c.1723) wrote to Weymouth apparently in the capacity as art advisor or agent to the Earl of Clarendon, to offer the set for ten shillings per painting.⁴⁵⁰

The group listed in the 1672 inventory comprised portraits of Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, 'Queen Elizabeth' (Elizabeth Woodville), Edward V, Richard III, Margaret Beaufort, Henry VII, Henry VIII, 'Queen Jane' (Jane Seymour), Edward VI, Mary I and James VI and I.⁴⁵¹ The pictures offered by Robinson in 1704 included all of the same sitters except Lady Margaret Beaufort and James VI and I, neither of whom are represented in the set currently at Longleat. Weymouth accepted the offer of the set along with some other paintings and prints from the Cobham collection, all of which were detailed in a surviving bill dated 3 August.⁴⁵² The current set, recorded in Table 5, is made up of fourteen pictures, one less than the '15 Pictures of Kings &c.' that Weymouth was charged for in 1704.⁴⁵³ However, the initial list of sitters provided by Robinson numbered fourteen and only '14 Kings and Queens heads in lacker'd frames' were recorded as hanging in the long gallery at Longleat in 1718.⁴⁵⁴ It is therefore likely that the extra portrait referred to in the bill was another royal portrait that did not belong with the set. Tudor-Craig has noted that the inclusion of Elizabeth Woodville but not other consorts such as the arguably more-important Elizabeth of York indicates that the set may now be missing some of its original figures but if this is the case, the paintings appear to have been lost before the set entered the collection at Longleat.⁴⁵⁵

The provenance of the paintings prior to 1672 is not known but it possible that they were always at Cobham Hall. Tudor-Craig has noted that each of the panels in the set has a red seal on the back bearing the arms of Henry O'Brien, Lord Ibrackan.⁴⁵⁶ As the first husband of Lady Katherine, Ibrackan may have added his seals to items already in the Cobham Hall collection after the death of Katherine's brother, the last duke.

⁴⁵⁰ Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 25, fols 276^r and 277^r, cited in an unpublished catalogue of paintings at Longleat House. I am grateful to Kate Harris for this reference.

⁴⁵¹ Robertson, 'Furniture and Pictures at Cobham Hall', p. 404.

⁴⁵² Thynne Papers, MS 25, fol. 376^r.

⁴⁵³ Ibid, fol. 376^r.

⁴⁵⁴ Ibid, fol. 277^r; Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 78, fol. 132^v.

⁴⁵⁵ Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 89.

⁴⁵⁶ Ibid, p. 88.

Alternatively, but perhaps less likely, the portraits may have been acquired by Ibrackan from elsewhere and were for some reason stored at Cobham Hall after he married Lady Katherine in around 1661 and before they were recorded in the inventory in 1672.⁴⁵⁷ As the son of Henry O'Brien, Baron Inchquin and 7th Earl of Thomond, Ibrackan was from an ancient Irish noble family; he was a member for Claire in the Irish Parliament of 1661 and represented Northampton in the English commons between 1670 and 1678.⁴⁵⁸ If the portraits came from O'Brien's family collection, they may have previously hung at Great Billing in Northamptonshire, the family's seat in England since 1628. Alternatively, the portraits may have been purchased or acquired by Ibrackan from another location.

Unusually, the Longleat set includes a portrait of Edward V. There are only two other known paintings of Edward that survive from this period: one in the NPG set and one at Welbeck Abbey, Nottinghamshire, in the collection of the Duke of Portland. The Longleat portrait has been extensively over-painted which makes it difficult to ascertain what the portrait originally looked like, but the same type has been used for all three portraits, although the orb and sceptre have been removed from the Longleat painting and a strange ermine 'ruff' has been added (probably at a later date). The portrait type is a fictional representation that may have been based on portraits of Edward VI.⁴⁵⁹ It is similar to the image of Edward V in Godet's woodcut portraits made in c.1560-62.

The portrait of Edward IV is of a type that appears to have developed in the late sixteenth century, becoming the standard image of the king for late-Elizabethan portrait sets. The type is also found in the NPG, Cornwallis, Ripon and Syon sets. Although derived from the portrait of Edward IV in the Royal Collection (or a common source), the late-Elizabethan version depicts the king with wider eyes, a thinner face, a more pointed nose and a slimmer neck. In addition, the elaborate vegetal pattern on Edward's golden gown in the Royal Collection picture has evolved into a more abstract and repetitive design in black that covers the whole of the material. In the earlier Royal

⁴⁵⁷ For a biography of Henry O'Brien, see E.R. Edwards and John P. Ferris, 'O'Brien, Henry, Lord Ibrackan (c.1642-78), of Great Billing, Northants.', *HPO*, <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/o8217brien-henry-1642-78>> [accessed 28 January 2014]. His marriage to Katherine, daughter of Lord George Stuart, 9th Seigneur d'Aubigny, is known to have taken place by 14 December 1661.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁹ Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 89.

Collection picture, six rows of pearls are visible on the front of the costume, each with a black coloured jewel hanging from it. The earliest known version of the Elizabethan type could be a painting now in the collection at Anglesey Abbey, Cambridgeshire (National Trust), which is probably from a dispersed set (provenance unknown) that also included a portrait of Henry VI that is now in the NPG collection.⁴⁶⁰ These portraits have been dated by dendrochronology to 1567 or later which is earlier than most other versions of this type.

There is no reason to doubt that the Longleat portraits were produced together as a set although, as Robinson observed when writing to Lord Weymouth in 1704, they seem to be ‘of different hands, some better painted than others’.⁴⁶¹ The inclusion of portraits of Edward III and Henry IV make it unlikely that the set was produced any earlier than c.1580. If the paintings were always at Cobham Hall they are likely to have been acquired by either William Brooke, 10th Baron Cobham (1527-1597) or his heir, Henry Brooke, 11th Baron Cobham (1564-1619) to provide decoration for the long gallery, which was added to the hall as part of a programme of building undertaken between 1584 and 1594.⁴⁶² Writing in 1973, Tudor-Craig suggested that the set dates from the 1570s but the comparison with other surviving paintings, including a similar portrait of Henry IV (NPG 310) that has been dated to 1585 or later, indicates that they were made at a slightly later date, probably in the late 1580s or the 1590s.⁴⁶³

Syon House, Middlesex (c.1590s)

Eight portraits now in the collection of the Duke of Northumberland at Syon House, probably represent the remains of a once-larger set.⁴⁶⁴ As it survives, the group commences with a portrait of Edward III and includes all the English monarchs up to Henry VII excluding Henry V and Edward V. The eighth portrait in the group represents Prince Arthur. The evidence from Table 5 indicates that portraits of Arthur were only occasionally included in royal sets although he was also represented in the

⁴⁶⁰ NTIN 515571; NPG 546. These portraits have been linked by dendrochronology: see Vol. 2, Table 3.

⁴⁶¹ Thynne Papers, MS 25, fol. 276^r.

⁴⁶² Girouard, *Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 461, n. 3.

⁴⁶³ Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 88. See Vol. 2, Table 3.

⁴⁶⁴ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, vi, pp. 28-32.

Lumley royal series and a late sixteenth-century set at Weston, Warwickshire (discussed below).⁴⁶⁵ Both the Syon and the Weston portraits of Arthur are derived from the painting owned by the Crown during the sixteenth century and now at Hever Castle, Kent.⁴⁶⁶ Arthur is not known to have been included in any sets that did not also include Elizabeth of York and Henry VIII and it is therefore likely that portraits representing these sitters are missing from the Syon group.

The portraits, which are all painted on panel, conform to the standard size of approximately 22 ½ x 17 inches (57.2 x 43.2 cm). They do not appear to be the work of a single hand but there are stylistic similarities across the group, particularly in the rendering of the ermine in the portraits of Edward III, Richard II and Richard III, and in the faces and hands of the four most recent sitters. There are some variations across the group, however. For example, while most of the panels have been constructed using vertically aligned boards, the portraits of Henry VI and Henry VII have been painted on panels made from horizontally aligned boards. In addition, there are some inconsistencies in the inscriptions. On the portraits of Henry IV and Henry VI, for instance, the correct Latinized form of the name has been used (*Henricus*), whereas the inscription on the portrait of Henry VII incorrectly uses the possessive form (*Henrici*). Furthermore, the portrait of Richard III is inscribed with '*Ricardus*' whereas the portrait of Richard II uses '*Ricardo*'. This does not necessarily mean they were not acquired as a set, however. It is possible that the differences represent different hands within a workshop or even that the portraits were brought together from a variety of sources to fulfil an order. They have certainly been together as a group since at least 1826 and the fact that they are all in similar, seventeenth-century frames, suggests that they have been together for much longer.⁴⁶⁷

The Syon portrait of Henry VII is an example of the type most commonly used for late-Elizabethan portrait sets that appears to have developed in the second half of the sixteenth century. Closely related examples include the paintings at Ripon and versions

⁴⁶⁵ On portraits of Arthur, see Frederick Hepburn, 'The Portraiture of Arthur, Prince of Wales', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 148 (1995), 148-68 (pp. 150-51).

⁴⁶⁶ On the Hever painting see *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630*, ed. by Karen Hearn (London: Tate Gallery, 1995), p. 36, no. 1 and *Lost Faces*, ed. by Grosvenor, pp. 35-6.

⁴⁶⁷ The date of the frames is discussed in Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 81.

in the NPG set, the 'Cornwallis set' (in the Royal Collection) and at Hardwick Hall (all discussed below). The face type is derived from Holbein's Whitehall Mural (1537) but there also seems to be an element of confluence with the earlier portrait type of Henry, exemplified by surviving versions at Anglesey Abbey, the Society of Antiquaries and the Victoria and Albert Museum, that may have been designed by Maynard Weywyck during Henry's lifetime.⁴⁶⁸ Although the face of this earlier type was not generally used for Elizabethan and Jacobean portrait sets, elements of the costume, notably the red robe over a gold gown, lined with brown fur rather than ermine, and the position of the sitter's hands, which hold a Tudor rose, have been retained in some of the versions. It was probably felt that the earlier bust portrait provided a more suitable compositional model than the mural, in which Henry was shown standing, but that Holbein's painting of the king's face was preferable, perhaps because it was felt he was depicted at an appropriate age. Other versions of the later type, however, show the king with costume similar to that seen in the mural including two versions in the Society of Antiquaries (LDSAL 298 and 299) and the version in the Dulwich set. The close relationship between the portrait of Henry VII in the Syon set and the version in the Cornwallis set, which has been dated by dendrochronology to 1588 or later (see below), indicates that the Syon paintings may have been produced around the 1590s.

The Syon portraits are thought to have come into the possession of the Duke of Northumberland through the Drummond family.⁴⁶⁹ Before they were at Syon, they were in the Northumberland collection at Albury Park in Surrey.⁴⁷⁰ From 1819 Albury was owned by the politician and banker Henry Drummond (1786-1860) and on his death it was inherited by his daughter, Louisa Drummond, the wife of Algernon Percy, 6th Duke of Northumberland. A description of Albury published in 1826 records the set almost as it is now:

The Entrance Hall contains some curious ancient portraits; eight are heads, of the same size, of King Edward the Third, King Henry the Fourth, King

⁴⁶⁸ NTIN 515569; LDSAL 329 and V&A 572-1882. The Whitehall Mural was destroyed by fire in 1698 but a copy made by Remigius van Leemput (*d.*1675) in 1667 survives in the Royal Collection (RCIN 405750).

⁴⁶⁹ Tudor-Craig, *Richard III*, p. 81.

⁴⁷⁰ The paintings were at Albury in *c.*1922 when they were photographed for *Country Life* (HAL, 'Notes on Collections: The Northumberland Collection'). The photographs were published in 1935.

Henry the Sixth, King Edward the Fourth, King Richard the Third, King Henry the Seventh, King Henry the Eighth, and Prince Arthur... There are also in the Hall portraits of Lord Burleigh; Cecil, Earl of Salisbury; and a whole length of Queen Elizabeth...⁴⁷¹

From 1638 Albury belonged to Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel (1585-1646) and it remained in the family until the death of Henry Howard, 6th Duke of Norfolk in 1684. If the portraits were always at Albury, it is conceivable that they may have come from the Arundel collection, although the house passed through a number of ownerships between 1684 and 1819 so it is perhaps more likely that they came to Albury by some other means and possibly from another property owned by the Drummond family.⁴⁷²

Weston, Warwickshire (c.1589-95)

A set of paintings formerly at Weston, Warwickshire originally included portraits of diverse illustrious men and women including a group of English royal figures. The entire set is discussed in more detail in Chapter 5 but the royal paintings will be examined here. The set is now dispersed, having been sold in separate lots in 1781 with the rest of the contents of Weston, an Elizabethan house near Long Compton.⁴⁷³ Some of the paintings survive, however and the sale catalogue of 1781 records the sitters that were included in the set at that time.⁴⁷⁴ The set included portraits of foreign rulers, military leaders, English courtiers and ecclesiastics as well as a group of English royal figures. They were larger than most paintings in sets from this period (the surviving panels each measure approximately 33 x 23 inches (83.8 x 58.4 cm)) and each panel had an arched top. Although the majority of the paintings were based on the standard bust portraits that had by this time been established, the size of the panels required the painter or painters to adapt the designs to fit a half-length format. The set was probably commissioned by Ralph Sheldon (c.1537-1613), a wealthy member of the

⁴⁷¹ John Preston Neale and Thomas Moule, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland*, 5 vols, 2nd ser. (London: Sherwood, Gilbert and Piper, 1824-29), III (1826) (not paginated).

⁴⁷² For a summary of the history of ownership, see Albury Park, Surrey <<http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1000299>> [accessed 28 January 2014].

⁴⁷³ Demolished in c.1826.

⁴⁷⁴ Christie's, London, *A Catalogue of all the Elegant and Rich Houshold Furniture, the Capital Library of well-chosen Books, Linen, China, Pictures, Prints and Drawings [...] of the Late William Sheldon, Esq; dec. At his Seat, called Weston, near Long Compton, in the County of Warwick*, (London: Christie & Ansell, 1781) (hereafter *Weston Park Sale*), 7th day's sale, 3 September, 1781, p. 37, lots 24-45. For further details, see Vol. 2, Appendix 10, pp. 223-35.

gentry, who began to build Weston in 1586.⁴⁷⁵ It was seen *in situ* in 1737 by Vertue, who described the paintings as hanging ‘in the great Room. all round almost. at the top.’⁴⁷⁶ An engraving of the upper end of the room published in Henry Shaw’s *Details of Elizabethan Architecture* (1839), which must have been based on an earlier view, depicts some of the portraits in a continuous frieze, flanked by carved figures, situated just below the cornice of the room (figure 33).⁴⁷⁷ The paintings were also seen at Weston by Horace Walpole, 4th earl of Orford (1717-1797), who visited in 1768, and John Loveday (1711-1789), who witnessed them in 1747.⁴⁷⁸

The English royal figures represented in the set were Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII, Elizabeth of York, Prince Arthur, Henry VIII and Edward VI. The portraits of Henry V and Edward IV are now at Knebworth House, Hertfordshire; Henry VI and Henry VII are at Eton College, Berkshire and the portraits of Richard III and Edward VI are both in private collections.⁴⁷⁹ The current whereabouts of the portraits of Elizabeth of York, Prince Arthur and Henry VIII is unknown. In his catalogue of decorative painting, Croft-Murray stated that the set included portraits of English sovereigns ‘from Henry IV to Elizabeth I, excluding Edward V’.⁴⁸⁰ He appears to have been misled by the 1781 catalogue in which the first two paintings in the set are erroneously listed as ‘Henry IV’ rather than ‘Henry V’ and ‘Henry VI’ (lots 24 and 25). There is no other evidence that a portrait of Henry IV was included in the set and as

⁴⁷⁵ For biographical details, see Hilary L. Turner, ‘Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon, c.1537, d.1613’, <<http://www.tapestriescalledsheldon.info/pdfs/NEWPP33BIOGWmS.pdf>> [accessed 29 August 2012]; S.M. Thorpe and Alan Davidson, ‘SHELDON, Ralph (c.1537-1613) of Beoley, Worcs.’, *HPO* <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/sheldon-ralph-1537-1613>> [accessed 8 February 2014].

⁴⁷⁶ Vertue, *Vertue Note Books*, IV, Walpole Society XXIV (1935-36) [hereafter ‘Vertue IV’], p. 140.

⁴⁷⁷ Henry Shaw, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture* (London: Pickering, 1839), pl. 3. According to the caption the view was taken from ‘Sketches by R. Bridgens’. Richard Bridgens was a designer and architect who published a number of architectural engravings, notably in his *Furniture with candelabra and interior decoration* (London: Pickering, 1838). I have been unable to trace the publication that this particular view came from but as Bridgens was not born until 1785 it must have been based on a pre-existing record.

⁴⁷⁸ Paget Toynbee, ‘Walpole’s Journals of Visits to Country Seats’, *The Sixteenth Volume of the Walpole Society*, (Oxford: OUP, 1928), pp. 10-80 (p. 62.); Markham, *John Loveday of Caversham*, p. 538.

⁴⁷⁹ I am indebted to Frederick Hepburn for sharing information about this set, including the location of the portraits of Henry V and Edward IV. I am also grateful to Clare Fleck at Knebworth House and Henrietta Ryan at Eton College for allowing me to examine the paintings.

⁴⁸⁰ Croft-Murray, *Decorative Painting*, I, p. 176.

neither Henry V nor Henry VI appear elsewhere in the 1781 list, we can assume with some certainty that lots 24 and 25 referred to these paintings. Indeed, in a copy of the catalogue annotated by the auctioneer, the second 'Henry IV' has been altered to 'Henry 6'.⁴⁸¹ Croft-Murray's assertion that the series went up to Elizabeth I was presumably derived from the fact that lot 29 of the sale catalogue lists a portrait of 'Queen Elizabeth', without identifying which Elizabeth this was. However, as the royal portraits are listed in chronological order in the catalogue, and as lot 29 comes between portraits of Henry VII and Prince Arthur, we can be relatively certain that it was actually a portrait of Elizabeth of York. Furthermore, when Vertue saw the set, he recorded seeing portraits of 'H. 7' and 'his Qu'.⁴⁸² None of the eyewitnesses recorded seeing a portrait of Elizabeth I among the paintings.

The Weston portraits of Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV and Richard III are all derived from the Royal Collection paintings. The heads, shoulders and hands, in particular, are very close to the originals and may have been made from tracings of the prototypes. The portrait of Edward IV is closer to the Royal Collection painting than it is to the late-Elizabethan type that was most commonly used in portrait sets. Some small changes have been made to the designs in the process of adapting them to fit a larger panel. For example, the position of Henry V's right hand has been altered. The other paintings in the group also derive from standard types. The portrait of Henry VII is based on the Whitehall Mural image although the costume, the position of the hands and the green-patterned background resemble an early portrait of Henry VII in the collection at Hatfield House and similar versions in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow and at Helmingham Hall.⁴⁸³ The portrait of Edward VI is derived from the full-length type attributed to Scrots and painted in around 1550. A good version of the painting owned by Lumley is now in the Royal Collection.⁴⁸⁴ Many versions of the type survive, the majority reduced to a bust format, and it was evidently the standard type used in

⁴⁸¹ Cambridge University Library, classmark: Munby.c.10. It may also be significant that the inscription on the portrait of Henry V now reads 'HENRY. THE. V.' but an arabic number '6' can be seen beneath the 'V' indicating that the painting was at one time misidentified.

⁴⁸² 'Vertue IV', p. 140.

⁴⁸³ Auerbach and Adams, *Painting and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, p. 34, no. 9; Burrell Collection 35.632. See Vol. 2, Appendix 2, 'Henry VII', pp. 107 for details of the Helmingham Hall picture.

⁴⁸⁴ RCIN 405751; Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 66 and Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 71.

Elizabethan and Jacobean portrait sets.⁴⁸⁵ Like the Lumley painting, the Weston portrait has a gold curtain in the background, a detail that is not replicated in many of the smaller versions, which may indicate that it was copied from a full-length painting.⁴⁸⁶

Although I have been unable to trace the portraits of Henry VIII and Prince Arthur, records dating from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries provide us with some details about their appearance. In 1781, the year of the sale, Edward Edwards (1738-1806) made a watercolour drawing of the portrait of Arthur.⁴⁸⁷ The drawing reveals that, like the others, the portrait was a half-length on an arched-top panel and that it had a similar patterned background to the portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III. In addition, the inscription identifying the sitter as 'PRINCE ARTUR' is similar in style to the lettering found on all the other portraits. The portrait of Arthur is derived from the picture formerly in the Royal Collection and now at Hever Castle, and it is similar to the portrait of the prince in the Syon set.⁴⁸⁸ In the Weston portrait, the prince holds a downward-facing sword in his proper left hand but this is the only major deviation from the prototype. In 1781 the Weston painting was acquired by Robert Child (1739-1782) of Osterley Park, Middlesex and it subsequently entered the collection of the Earls of Jersey through the marriage of Child's granddaughter, Sarah Sophia Fane (1785-1867), to George Villiers, later 5th Earl of Jersey (1773-1859) in 1804.⁴⁸⁹ In 1861, George Scharf tracked it down to the Jersey collection at Middleton Park, Oxfordshire, and his notes on its appearance and condition were published in *Archaeologia* in 1870.⁴⁹⁰ The

⁴⁸⁵ In addition to the versions detailed in Vol. 2, Appendix 1, pp. 6-65, other bust versions are at Anglesey Abbey, Trinity College, Cambridge and Christ's Hospital Foundation, West Sussex (see Vol. 2, Appendix 2. 'Edward VI', pp. 122-25).

⁴⁸⁶ A bust version in the Royal Collection that may have been acquired by the Crown during the reign of Elizabeth I has a similar curtain (RCIN 403452).

⁴⁸⁷ The drawing was formerly in the collection of Horace Walpole at Strawberry Hill. It was purchased by the Earl of Derby in 1842 and was kept in the collection at Knowsley. See George Scharf, 'Further Observations on the Portraits of Arthur Prince of Wales, by George Scharf, Esq., F.S.A.: in a letter to John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A.', *Archaeologia*, 39 (1870), 457-63, pl. 20.

⁴⁸⁸ On the relationship of the Syon and Weston portraits of Arthur to the Royal Collection picture, see Hepburn, 'The Portraiture of Arthur', pp. 149-153, 157-59.

⁴⁸⁹ A note on the back of Edward's watercolour records Robert Child's acquisition of the painting and the dimensions of the panel (Scharf, 'Further Observations on the Portraits of Arthur Prince of Wales', p. 458).

⁴⁹⁰ *Ibid*, pp. 458-59, 462-63. By this time, the painting had been much altered by cleaning and retouching: the patterned background had been completely painted over and the inscription was no longer visible.

painting is no longer in the Jersey collection and there are no known references to its subsequent location.⁴⁹¹

The portrait of Henry VIII was last recorded at Christie's on 8 May 1908 (lot 38) in a sale of items from the collection of Jane, Dowager Marchioness of Conyngham (1833-1907) that also included the Weston portrait of Richard III (lot 39).⁴⁹² In 1824 the portrait of Henry appeared in a sale alongside the Weston paintings of Edward VI and Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex (1565-1601).⁴⁹³ The catalogue notes describe the king as wearing 'a silver and gold dress, a white fur tippet over his shoulders, cap and feather' and note that he was holding a glove in his right hand and resting on a green table. A line drawing of the painting on the frontispiece of the catalogue indicates that the portrait used the forward-facing type established by Holbein for his Whitehall Mural. The white fur tippet described in the catalogue probably refers to the fur or ermine lining of Henry's cloak, which was sometimes depicted brown and sometimes in white (as in, for example, the full-length versions at Petworth and Parham, both in West Sussex and the bust versions at Helmingham Hall and Hardwick Hall). The immediate prototype of the Weston portrait is not known but, if the description in the 1824 catalogue is accurate, it is likely to have been similar to a half-length version from c.1560-80, now in the Royal Collection, in which the king is also depicted holding gloves in his right hand and resting his left hand on a table.⁴⁹⁴

Dendrochronology has provided a *terminus post quem* for three of the royal portraits (Henry VI, Henry VII and Richard III) as well as a portrait of Thomas Wolsey from the

⁴⁹¹ The Earl of Jersey took his painting collection to the island of Jersey when he gave Osterley to the National Trust in 1949 and many works of art were subsequently destroyed in a fire there.

⁴⁹² It has been suggested that the portrait of Richard III was acquired by George, 3rd Marquess of Conyngham (1825-82) as part of the remodelling of Slane Castle (Historical Portraits Image Library, *Portrait of King Richard III, The Sheldon Master* (London: Philip Mould Ltd) <<http://www.historicalportraits.com/Gallery.asp?Page=Item&ItemID=1030&Desc=King-Richard-III-%7C-The-Sheldon-Master>> [accessed 4 February 2014]). The paintings of Henry VIII and Richard III were purchased by different people in 1781 (W. Silby and Ward respectively).

⁴⁹³ H. Rodd, *A Catalogue of Authentic Portraits: Painted in oil, on pannel and canvas, miniatures, marble busts, &c. ... the whole of which are now offered for sale at the prices affixed / by H. Rodd* (London: printed by J. Compton, Middle Street, Cloth Fair, 1824), p. 21, no. 59.

⁴⁹⁴ RCIN 406135, acquired by George III.

set that is now in the NPG collection.⁴⁹⁵ All four portraits are painted on Eastern Baltic oak felled in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. The most recent tree ring, found on the Henry VI panel, dates from 1584. As this was a sapwood ring, we can be relatively certain that the wood used for this panel was felled between 1584 and 1594. If we assume that all the Weston paintings were produced at the same time, the set cannot have been made before 1584. It is probable that panel used for the Henry VI portrait was made relatively soon after the tree was felled because sapwood was more likely to be removed if the wood was left for a long time to season as it would be more visible. The panel is unlikely, therefore, to have been made much later than around 1595. As the panels are of an unusual size and format, we can assume that they were made specifically for the Weston commission and it is therefore unlikely that much time elapsed between their construction and the painting of the portraits. Some of the sitters known to have been included in the set also help us to date the paintings. For example, the inclusion of the 2nd Earl of Essex could indicate that the set was produced before Essex's downfall and execution in 1601.⁴⁹⁶ Furthermore, the set included a portrait of Henry IV of France (1553-1610), who became king in 1589.⁴⁹⁷ It is therefore probable that the set was made in 1589 or later.

Hardwick New Hall, Derbyshire (before 1601)

A surviving inventory of the goods belonging to Bess of Hardwick at Hardwick New Hall, Derbyshire taken in 1601 recorded a group of royal portraits in the gallery that has been widely interpreted as a portrait set.⁴⁹⁸ However, as Gillian White has shown in her doctoral thesis on the original furnishings and decoration of Hardwick

⁴⁹⁵ NPG 32. See Vol. 2, Table 6. The Eton College paintings were examined by Ian Tyers in 2009, see Ian Tyers, 'Tree-Ring Analysis of 10 Panel Paintings from Eton College, June 2009' (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., 2009). The portrait of Richard III, now in a private collection, was examined by Tyers for Philip Mould Ltd in 1995, see Historical Portraits Image Library, *Portrait of King Richard III*.

⁴⁹⁶ *Weston Park Sale*, p. 37, lot 45. This portrait was at Middleton Park along with the portrait of Arthur in 1861. Its current whereabouts is unknown.

⁴⁹⁷ *Ibid*, lot 37.

⁴⁹⁸ A transcription of one of the three surviving versions of the inventory was published with commentary in 2001: Levey and Thornton, *Of Household Stuff* (see pages 49-50 for the pictures in the gallery). Scholars have cited the Hardwick series as an example of a royal portrait set from this period since the eighteenth century; see, for example James Granger, *A Biographical History of England: From Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, 5th edn, 6 vols (London: Baynes, 1824), I, p. 17; Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 47; Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p.23 and Cooper, 'The Enchantment of the Familiar Face', p. 165.

Hall, not all of the paintings in this group were acquired at the same time.⁴⁹⁹ In the inventory, the series commenced with a portrait of Elizabeth I, after which the sitters were listed in chronological order. They included Edward II, Edward III, Richard II,⁵⁰⁰ Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Edward IV, Richard III, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I and ‘Quene Elizabethes picture in a less table’. The description of the second portrait of Elizabeth implies that the first portrait of the queen was a larger painting. This may have been the grand full-length painting still hanging in the gallery today, which has been dated to c.1598-99.⁵⁰¹

The Countess of Shrewsbury’s portrait collection was extensive and this group of royal portraits was part of a wider assemblage that also included portraits of foreign monarchs, bishops, politicians and courtiers and family members. Some of these portraits were also hanging in the gallery in 1601, including portraits of ‘Quene Anne’, ‘Phillip, King of Spayne’ and ‘Quene Katherin’ (probably Anne Boleyn, Philip II and Katherine of Aragon).⁵⁰² Portraits of the latter two survive at Hardwick today.⁵⁰³ These portraits, however, are not listed chronologically with the rest of the English royal figures in the inventory, but come further down the list after portraits of the king of France, the king of Scots and the Virgin Mary which suggests that they were not viewed as being part of the main royal series. In addition, there were other portraits of English monarchs on display in other rooms at the house. In the High Great Chamber, for example, there were portraits of Henry VIII, Elizabeth I, Mary I and Edward VI.⁵⁰⁴ This may have been a second small set. In 1590, Lumley had a set of marble sculptures of the same four sitters.⁵⁰⁵

The new hall at Hardwick was begun in 1590.⁵⁰⁶ It was one of the most grand ‘prodigy’ houses of the Elizabethan era. Previously, Bess lived at the Tudor manor of Chatsworth,

⁴⁹⁹ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, II, pp. 462-72.

⁵⁰⁰ All copies of the inventory list Richard III here but, as White has pointed out, this is likely to be a repeated scribal error as Richard III is also listed in the correct chronological position (White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, II, p. 466).

⁵⁰¹ NTIN 1129128. *Elizabeth I and Her People*, pp. 68-69, no. 10.

⁵⁰² Levey and Thornton, *Of Household Stuff*, p. 50.

⁵⁰³ Philip II of Spain: NTIN 1129159; Katherine of Aragon: NTIN 1129157.

⁵⁰⁴ Levey and Thornton, *Of Household Stuff*, p. 48.

⁵⁰⁵ Bracken and Howard, ‘Lumley Castle and its Inventories’, p. 32.

⁵⁰⁶ Santina M. Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles* (London: National Trust, 1998), p. 17.

also in Derbyshire, which had been purchased by her first husband Sir William Cavendish in 1549.⁵⁰⁷ She moved to Hardwick Old Hall in 1584, which she had purchased the previous year in the name of her second and favoured son, William.⁵⁰⁸ Inventories of the goods at Chatsworth and Hardwick Old Hall were also made in 1601 but no paintings were recorded at either which indicates that the paintings recorded in previous inventories of these other properties had been moved to the new house by this time. As early as the 1540s, Cavendish owned portraits of Henry VII, Henry VIII and ‘Quene Anne’ as well as a painted cloth depicting Henry VIII, Henry VII, Edward IV and Richard III, which were then at Northaw, his home before he acquired Chatsworth, and it is likely that some were among the paintings at Hardwick in 1601.⁵⁰⁹ A note in a surviving account book reveals that pictures were transported from Chatsworth to the new hall on two separate occasions in 1598.⁵¹⁰ However, new paintings were certainly added to the collection in the 1590s, along with other luxury objects including hangings.⁵¹¹ The years between 1596 and 1599 seem to have been a key time for the decoration of the long gallery; two chimneypieces were installed in 1596 and 1597 and the newly acquired tapestries were hung in 1598.⁵¹² In the intervening period, John Balehouse had been employed to paint a decorative frieze of strapwork and grotesques at the top of the room.⁵¹³ It is probable that it was around 1599, when the larger elements of the decoration were in place, that thoughts turned to the picture hang.

Bess’s son William purchased a relatively large number of paintings in London in 1599 and 1600, which he sent up to the new hall. Some of them were among the royal portraits listed in the long gallery in 1601. In October 1599, for example, he bought the portraits of Edward VI, Edward III and Mary I along with paintings of Reginald Pole, Thomas Wolsey and Stephen Gardiner.⁵¹⁴ Earlier that year, in April, he purchased

⁵⁰⁷ Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance*, p. 9.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁵⁰⁹ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, II, pp. 325-326, 331.

⁵¹⁰ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, I, p. 170. No inventories of Chatsworth were taken in the 1570s or 1580s.

⁵¹¹ On a visit to London in 1591-92, Bess acquired four sets of tapestries for the house, one new and three second-hand (Levey and Thornton, *Of Household Stuff*, p. 8).

⁵¹² Levey, *An Elizabethan Inheritance*, p. 18.

⁵¹³ *Ibid.*

⁵¹⁴ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, I, p. 170; Devonshire MSS, Chatsworth, Hardwick MS 10a, fol. 48^v. The paintings of Pole and Gardiner survive at the house (NTIN 1129160 and 1129153).

sixteen unnamed ‘paynted pictures in tables’ and a portrait of Queen Elizabeth.⁵¹⁵ He then went on to buy another group of five unnamed pictures during the period December 1599 to April 1600.⁵¹⁶ White has suggested that some of the royal portraits in the gallery in 1601 may have been among the unnamed pictures purchased during this period.⁵¹⁷ As she has pointed out, if evenly priced, the group of five purchased between December 1599 and April 1600 would have cost 6s. 8d. each, the same as amount as each of the portraits of Wolsey, Gardiner and Pole, which are comparable in size and quality to paintings found in royal portrait sets of this period.⁵¹⁸

Some sixteenth-century royal portraits survive in the collection at Hardwick.⁵¹⁹ Among them are a portrait of Henry VII and a portrait of Henry VIII that appear to date from the first half of the sixteenth century.⁵²⁰ These portraits may be identical with those recorded at Northaw in the 1540s. In contrast, the extant portraits of Henry IV, Henry VI and Edward VI, plus second portraits of Henry VII and Henry VIII are all types that were circulating towards the end of the century.⁵²¹ These paintings are most likely to have been among the portraits purchased in 1599. The portrait of Henry VI and the second Henry VII, both correspond closely to their counterparts in the Ripon, Longleat, Syon, Cornwallis and NPG sets and are have very similar inscriptions to each other, which may indicate that they came from the same source. The portrait of Henry IV is of the standard type but it appears, stylistically, to have been painted at a slightly later date than some of the other versions. It is possible that this is the result of overpainting but it may be that it is a later copy of a painting that was acquired in or around 1599.⁵²² The third portrait of Henry VIII, which is on canvas and probably post-dates the 1601 inventory, may also be a later copy of an earlier, now lost, portrait.

⁵¹⁵ Hardwick MS 10a, fols 39, 44.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid*, the foliation ends at fol. 72 and this entry comes after this point.

⁵¹⁷ White’s thesis includes an appendix in which she traces as far as possible the origin of each of the paintings listed in the 1601 inventory: White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, II, pp. 462-72.

⁵¹⁸ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, I, p. 171.

⁵¹⁹ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, vii, pp. 33-37 and Table 7.

⁵²⁰ NTIN 1129171 and 1129178.

⁵²¹ NTIN 1129169; 1129170; 1129167; 1129166 and 1129176.

⁵²² Between 1608 and 1613 William Cavendish, to whom Bess bequeathed the hall, employed the painted Rowland Lockey (c.1566-1616) to produced around thirty pictures for Hardwick, the majority of them copies: Arianne Burnette, ‘Lockey, Rowland (c.1566–1616)’, *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, September 2010) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16897>> [accessed 15 February 2014].

The relatively small number of surviving portraits from the royal group listed in the 1601 inventory makes it difficult to ascertain whether there was a portrait set amid it. However, the similarity between the portraits of Henry VI and the second Henry VII makes it probable that some of the portraits were acquired from the same source. Moreover, the fact that these portraits are so similar to other versions in sets suggests that even if the Hardwick portraits were not acquired *en bloc*, the paintings were sourced from workshops that were also selling portraits in sets. White has argued that the purchase of at least three portraits of English monarchs in 1599 ‘shows Bess consciously continuing and enlarging a set of which she already had the basis’.⁵²³ Bess was clearly aware of new fashions in interior decoration and she would undoubtedly have seen or heard about similar royal series in other noble houses. We know, for example, that she received a description of the gallery and great chamber at Theobalds from her son, Charles.⁵²⁴ It is likely, therefore, that this inspired her to form a fashionable portrait set of her own for the newly built long gallery at Hardwick and to this end she consciously filled gaps in her existing collection of English royal portraits.

The ‘Cornwallis’ Set, The Royal Collection (c.1590-1610)

The ‘Cornwallis’ set comprises fifteen royal portraits, commencing with Edward III and including all the English monarchs to Mary I (except Edward V and Richard III), plus Elizabeth Woodville, Margaret Beaufort, Elizabeth of York, Katherine of Aragon and Anne Boleyn.⁵²⁵ It is thought that the paintings entered the Royal Collection during the reign of George II whose queen, Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach (1683-1737), had an interest in Tudor portraiture and is known to have displayed some of the sixteenth-century portraits already in the collection in her dressing room at Kensington.⁵²⁶ According to the print collector and biographer James Granger (1723-1776), Queen Caroline had acquired a set of royal portraits for Kensington ‘from Lord Cornwallis’s gallery, at Culford, in Suffolk’ after she had ‘begged’ Cornwallis for them.⁵²⁷ Granger described two royal sets at Kensington: one made up of the older

⁵²³ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, I, p. 171.

⁵²⁴ Ibid, p. 305.

⁵²⁵ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, pp. 49-52, 62-63, 67, nos. 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 38, 41, 42, 51 and 54. See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, viii, pp. 38-45.

⁵²⁶ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 27.

⁵²⁷ Granger, *A Biographical History of England*, I, p. 17.

portraits that were already in the Royal Collection, and one made up of the paintings discussed here. He assumed that the older portraits were those that had come from Cornwallis, but as these paintings were already in the collection, it must have been the other set, which Granger deemed to be worse in quality and painted by one hand, that came from this source.⁵²⁸

Caroline only resided at Kensington after her husband ascended the throne in 1727 so it is likely that she acquired the set after this date. Millar has suggested that the portrait of Henry VIII in the set may be identical with a portrait recorded at Kensington in c.1729 as 'The head of K. Henry 8th in a new Gilt frame Cleand'.⁵²⁹ If so, the group probably entered the Royal Collection between 1727 and 1729. John Loveday appears to have seen the paintings at Kensington in June 1733; in an account of his visit, he recorded seeing a group of 'woful heads of other Kings and their Consorts' that included the majority of the sitters represented in the current group.⁵³⁰ If the paintings came from Culford Hall in the 1720s, it must have been Charles Cornwallis (1700-1762), 5th Baron Cornwallis of Eye from 1722 and later 1st Earl of Cornwallis, whom Caroline 'begged' for them. Culford Hall had come into the possession of the Cornwallis family through marriage in 1660. The provenance of the paintings is not known but it is possible that they came into the family's possession with the house. The Elizabethan mansion at Culford was built in 1591 by Sir Nicholas Bacon (c.1543-1624), the son of Elizabeth's former Lord Keeper.⁵³¹ The house passed directly from the Bacon family to the Cornwallis family so it is plausible that they were originally acquired by Sir Nicholas Bacon to provide decoration for the newly built house.

Because of the lack of information about their provenance, it is difficult to ascertain whether or not these portraits were originally made as a set or if they were brought together at a later date. It is clear from the appearance of the paintings that not all fifteen were produced by the same hand and probably not in the same workshop. It might be the case that, as with some other sets, the paintings were assembled from a number of different sources but that they were always intended to form a series. Alternatively,

⁵²⁸ Millar, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*, p. 27.

⁵²⁹ Ibid, p. 62.

⁵³⁰ Markham, *John Loveday of Caversham*, p. 516.

⁵³¹ English Heritage, 'Culford Park' < <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1001363> > [accessed 2 February 2014].

however, the portraits may have been gathered together by a later collector with an enthusiasm for this genre of painting.⁵³² The panel used for the portrait of Henry VII from this set was examined by Ian Tyers in January 2013 and given a *terminus post quem* of 1588 and a conjectural usage date of 1588 to 1620.⁵³³ Even if the other portraits weren't made together with this painting, it is likely that they were produced around the same time. The paintings in the set are comparable to those in the Longleat, Syon and NPG sets and for this reason I would suggest that they were all made between the years 1590 and 1610.

The 'Hornby' Set, National Portrait Gallery, London (1597-1618)

The royal set now in the collection of the NPG is composed of sixteen paintings depicting William I, Henry I, Stephen, Henry II, John, possibly Henry III, Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn and Mary I.⁵³⁴ Prior to recent technical analysis undertaken as part of the MATB project at the NPG, it was thought that the group might have been made up of two or possibly three smaller sets. In 1974 Robin Gibson suggested that, on the basis of style, the portraits divided up as follows:

Group A: William I, Henry I, Stephen, Henry II, John, Henry III

Group B: Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Edward IV, Edward V and Anne Boleyn

Group C: Richard III, Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary I.⁵³⁵

Gibson suggested that the portraits of the first six kings (Group A) were painted at a later date than the rest of the set and possibly around 1620.⁵³⁶ He distinguished the portraits in Group C from the rest of the paintings in Group B on the basis of quality (the portraits of the most recent sitters are the most skilfully painted portraits in the set).

⁵³² Lorne Campbell has noted that sets were sometimes falsely put together in this way (Campbell, *The Early Flemish Pictures*, p. xlvii).

⁵³³ Ian Tyers, 'Tree-Ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the Royal Collection' (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., October 2010), pp. 28-30.

⁵³⁴ See Vol. 2, Appendix 1, ix, pp. 46-54. The identity of NPG 4980(6) has been discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 60-61; for the purposes of this discussion, I will refer to the painting as 'Henry III'.

⁵³⁵ Gibson, 'The National Portrait Gallery's Set', p. 82.

⁵³⁶ Gibson, 'A Jacobean Gallery', p. 14.

As a result, until 2011, the NPG dated the portraits of the six earliest sitters to *c.*1620 and the rest of the paintings to *c.*1610. However, the technical analysis carried out at the NPG has revealed that all of the paintings in the group were produced around the same time, although there are distinct sub-groups within the set. It is probable, therefore, that the series was collected (or commissioned) from a number of different sources, either at the same time or over a relatively short period of time.

The paintings were purchased by the NPG in 1974 from the 10th Duke of Leeds Trust. They had been stored by the Gallery since 1930 following the death of George Osborne, 10th Duke of Leeds (1862-1927).⁵³⁷ As far as it is known, before it came to the NPG, the set was always at Hornby Castle, near Bedale, the Duke of Leeds' North Yorkshire seat.⁵³⁸ The earliest documentary reference to them, however, dates from 1868 when they were recorded hanging in two rows in the Nursery Passage (a corridor gallery) at the Castle.⁵³⁹ The 1868 list records a total of thirty-eight pictures in the Nursery Passage, plus two coats of arms. The arrangement appears to have been little changed since 1838 when an inventory of the house was made on the death of George Osbourne, 6th Duke of Leeds, at which point thirty-nine 'portraits and paintings' were left in the Nursery Passage after the Dowager Duchess had taken the items she required.⁵⁴⁰ The set was certainly in the Nursery Passage when catalogues of the collection were published

⁵³⁷ HAL, 'Notes on Collections: Hornby Castle, Yorkshire'.

⁵³⁸ It is possible that the portraits entered the Leeds collection from another property or that they were purchased from elsewhere. Some portraits at Hornby in 1927 are known to have come from Kiveton in South Yorkshire, the primary seat of the Dukes of Leeds until 1811/2, but the portrait set is not mentioned in an inventory of that property taken in 1727 (NAL MS L/1783/11A) and as Kiveton was only built in 1697, they cannot have come from there originally. Other properties they may have come from include Godolphin, Cornwall; South Mims, Hertfordshire and Thorpe Hall, South Yorkshire.

⁵³⁹ HAL, *Catalogue of the Painting and Portraits at Hornby Castle the Seat of the Duke of Leeds, 1868* (unpublished transcription of the MS catalogue at Hornby Castle). The sitters listed here correspond to the paintings in the extant set except for the fact that there are two Edward IIIs and a Henry VI but no Henry III or Henry VII. It is likely, therefore, that the confusion over the identity of the 'Henry III' portrait has long endured and was identified here as Edward IV. The portrait of Henry VII seems to have been mis-identified as Henry VI. When the sixteen portraits were offered to the NPG in 1930, a list of the sitters included two Edward IVs and a Henry VI but no Henry VII (HAL, 'Notes on Collections: Hornby Castle, Yorkshire').

⁵⁴⁰ Leeds, Yorkshire Archaeological Society MS DD5/12/4, fol. 113^r.

in 1898 and 1902 and apparently remained there until it was removed to the NPG stores in 1930.⁵⁴¹

Hornby Castle was originally built by the St. Quintins family in the fourteenth century and was rebuilt and enlarged by William, 1st Lord Conyers (1467/68-1524) under Henry VII.⁵⁴² In 1557 it passed into the possession of Elizabeth Conyers and her husband Thomas Darcy (*d.*1605) whose descendants became the earls of Holderness.⁵⁴³ On the death of the last Earl of Holderness in 1778 the property passed into the possession of Francis Godolphin Osborne, the 5th Duke of Leeds, through his marriage to Amelia, the earl's only daughter. The Castle was substantially rebuilt in the 1750s and was largely demolished following the break up of the estate in 1927.⁵⁴⁴ The owner of the house during the period in which these paintings are likely to have been made was either Thomas Darcy (*d.*1605) or his son, Conyers Darcy (1570-1653) who was later to become 4th Baron Conyers of Hornby and Baron Darcy of Knaith. Thomas Darcy was the son of Sir Arthur Darcy (*d.*1561), Lieutenant of the Tower of London from 1551 to 1553, and the grandson of Thomas Darcy, Baron Darcy (*c.*1467-1537), who had risen to high office under Henry VII and Henry VIII as a result of his military capabilities.⁵⁴⁵ The latter had been implicated in the Pilgrimage of Grace and executed as a result, at which point the title of the barony of Darcy was suspended; it remained so until the title was revived for Conyers Darcy in 1641.

⁵⁴¹ Anon, *Hornby Castle: Catalogue of Pictures* (London: Spottiswoode, 1898), p. 12; Anon, *Historical and Descriptive Catalogue of Pictures Belonging to his Grace the Duke of Leeds* (London: Darling, 1902), pp. 49-51.

⁵⁴² Anon, 'Hornby Castle, Yorkshire, The Seat of the Duke of Leeds', *Country Life*, 20: 497 (1906), 54-64 (p. 56).

⁵⁴³ Giles Worsley, 'Hornby Castle, Yorkshire', *Country Life*, 183:26 (1989), 188-93 (p. 188).

⁵⁴⁴ Worsley, p. 190; Nikolaus Pevsner, *Yorkshire, the North Riding*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966), p. 192. For more information on the architecture of Hornby Castle see Anthony Emery, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300-1500*, 3 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), I, p. 352. A sixteenth-century doorway survives in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow.

⁵⁴⁵ In his famous diary, Sir Henry Machyn notes that Arthur was instructed to take charge of the Tower and discharge Sir John Marham on 31 October 1551: *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550-1563*, ed. by John G. Nichols (London: Camden Society, 1848), p. 19. His father, Lord Thomas Darcy had risen from a family of the lesser gentry to become an intimate of Henry VII and was created Baron Darcy of Darcy, probably by writ of parliament on 25 January 1504. He was admitted to the Order of the Garter on 18 May 1509. See R.W. Hoyle, 'Darcy, Thomas, Baron Darcy of Darcy (*b.* in or before 1467, *d.* 1537)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7148>> [accessed 1 February 2014].

Thomas Darcy (*d.*1605) was never knighted and does not appear to have reached the social and professional heights of his grandfather, father or son. It is stated in William Dugdale's *Visitation of Yorkshire* that he, too, served as Lieutenant of the Tower, a biographical detail that is repeated in other accounts of his life, but I have been unable to find evidence that this was the case.⁵⁴⁶ A list of Lieutenants of the Tower from Edward IV to James VI and I, made during the reign of Charles I, does not include his name, although it confirms that his father Sir Arthur Darcy held the position.⁵⁴⁷ However, as J.T. Cliffe has observed, through his marriage to Elizabeth Conyers, the only daughter and heir of John Conyers, 3rd Baron Conyers (*d.*1557) and consequent acquisition of the Hornby estate, Thomas Darcy paved the way for the family's rapid social ascendancy under his son.⁵⁴⁸ It is possible that the portrait set was acquired as part of a campaign to advertise the historical significance of the family, with a view to regaining the title of the barony. Although it was not until 1640 that Conyers Darcy successfully petitioned the king in Parliament to have his title restored, it is likely that this would have been an earlier ambition within the family. It was perhaps felt to be achievable, for example, when Conyers was knighted by King James VI and I at Whitehall on 23 July 1603.⁵⁴⁹ Suspicion of recusancy may also have motivated the family to acquire a series of royal portraits. Roman Catholicism remained strong in Yorkshire under Elizabeth; according to Cliffe, in 1604, 254 of 641 gentry families in the country were Catholic and 112 were at least partly recusant.⁵⁵⁰ Families such as the Darcys, who are likely to have been under scrutiny regarding their religion, may have used portraiture to assert their loyalty to the Crown.

The extensive technical analysis undertaken on this set at the NPG in 2011 has revealed that the paintings were produced by a complex network of artists and craftsmen involving as many as a dozen painters working in up to four or five workshops.⁵⁵¹ The

⁵⁴⁶ J.W. Clay, ed., *Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire, with additions*, 3 vols (Exeter: Pollard, 1899-1917), II, p. 80; Anon, 'Hornby Castle, Yorkshire', p. 56.

⁵⁴⁷ TNA, SP 16/531 fol. 194.

⁵⁴⁸ J.T. Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: Athlone Press, 1969), pp. 99-100. For a contemporary pedigree of the Conyers of Hornby family see *The Visitation of Yorkshire made in the years, 1584/5, by Robert Glover, Somerset Herald*, ed. by Joseph Foster (London: printed privately for the editor, 1875), pp. 71-72.

⁵⁴⁹ Arthur Collins, *The Peerage of England*, 4th edn, 7 vols (London: Woodfall, 1768), IV, p. 32.

⁵⁵⁰ Cliffe, *The Yorkshire Gentry*, p. 189.

⁵⁵¹ The analysis was carried out by Sophie Plender and Polly Saltmarsh as part of the MATB project. Detailed results can be found on the MATB database (forthcoming): NPG 4980(1-16).

results indicate that the set was assembled from a number of subgroups. The first group includes the portraits of Henry I, Stephen, John and Henry III, which are visually very alike and have been painted in a similar way. For example, in each case the flesh paint has been applied using a softly blended technique distinct from that seen elsewhere in the set and infrared reflectography has revealed the underdrawing in these paintings to be comparable. Furthermore, all four paintings are based on woodcuts from the T.T. series. Dendrochronology found that the two-board panel on which the portrait of Stephen is painted contains wood from a tree used for the King John panel and another tree used for the Henry III panel, providing a further link between the paintings.⁵⁵² The portrait of Henry I has been painted with a higher degree of skill than the others, however, and might therefore have been produced by a different artist working in the same studio.

A second distinct group was found to comprise the portraits of Edward III, Henry IV, Edward IV, Edward V and Anne Boleyn. In each painting the sitter's eyebrows and facial features were painted in full before the flesh paint was applied, which is relatively unusual. The use of pigments is comparable across the group and the paintings all have a distinctive streaky grey priming layer. In addition, the painted inscriptions are strikingly similar and appear to have been applied by the same hand. Dendrochronology has again provided further evidence of a subgroup here, linking the portraits of Edward IV, Edward V and Anne Boleyn. Despite these similarities, however, differences in technique have also been detected: for example, the portrait of Edward III has been more finely painted than the others which again indicates that this group is the product of a workshop rather than a single artist.

Dendrochronology also linked the portraits of Richard II and Richard III and, although these two paintings do not appear to be wholly by the same hand, the paint handling of the jewels is very similar and may have been executed by the same painter. The portraits of William I and Henry II were also found to contain wood that probably came from the same tree and these portraits also share stylistic similarities. For example, in both paintings the details of the gilding have been defined with brown lines applied in a

⁵⁵² Ian Tyers, 'The tree-Ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the National Portrait Gallery: Group 4.5', (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., 2011). See Vol. 2, Table 4.

comparable way although the portrait of Henry II has been painted in a softer, less crisp manner than that of William. No specific material links were found between the four subgroups detailed above, which suggests that the paintings probably came together from four distinct workshops. Furthermore, no clear links were found between the other paintings (those representing Henry VII, Henry VIII and Mary I) but all three are relatively typical examples of the standard portrait types used for sets.

Despite the fact that the paintings came from a number of sources, the shared provenance of the paintings and the fact that they appear to have been produced around the same time makes it likely that they were brought together by their first owner to form a set. The dendrochronology carried out across the group has revealed that all sixteen panels were made from trees felled in the Eastern Baltic, probably in the 1580s or early 1590s. As the T.T. series was used as a source for some of the paintings, at least part of the set must have been produced in 1597 or later, and the fact that none of the *Baziliologia* prints were used suggests that it was made before 1618. The inclusion of Anne Boleyn and no other consorts in the group may indicate that it was made in the last years of Elizabeth's reign, although, given the absence of Henry V and Henry VI in particular, it is probable that paintings have been lost from the group.

Robert Hare's Gallery, London (before 1611)

Historian Hilary L. Turner has recently uncovered documentary evidence for what may have been a royal portrait set in a London townhouse in the early seventeenth century.⁵⁵³ In a will written in July 1611, antiquary Robert Hare bequeathed a collection of 'paynted pictures of Kynges Queens Bisshopps and other great personages' to his nephew, Nicholas Tymperley. Turner has linked this reference to an inventory of paintings surviving in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, headed 'Theis things remaynyng in Sir John Hobart's gallery at the Spittal are belonging unto Robert Hare'.⁵⁵⁴ Having been granted a lease of fifty years on the property at the Spittal in 1580, Hare made a number of changes to the property, which included the addition of a gallery. He continued to

⁵⁵³ Hilary L. Turner, 'Glimpses of a gallery: the maps and 'paynted pictures' of Robert Hare', *Bodleian Library Record*, forthcoming. I am grateful to Dr Turner for allowing me to use this article.

⁵⁵⁴ Oxford, Bodleian MS Tanner 98, fols 80-81 cited by Turner in 'Glimpses of a gallery', first paragraph.

occupy several of the rooms in the property even after the lease was assigned to two members of the Hobart family in 1609 (Edward Hobart of Hales Hill, Norfolk and his brother Robert). Turner has argued that Sir John Hobart also shared the accommodation and that the Bodleian inventory was drawn up around this time, probably between 1609 and 1611. The paintings are not known to survive, but they are included here to provide further evidence of the market for sets (or at least groups) of portraits of English kings and queens at this time. Furthermore, the example shows that the fashion for royal sets extended beyond the country house.

The Bodleian inventory lists thirty-two paintings in the gallery, seventeen of which were portraits of English kings and queens.⁵⁵⁵ The royal series began with Edward III and included all the English monarchs up to and including James VI and I, with the exception of Edward V. In addition, the portraits of Katherine of Aragon, Anne Boleyn, Philip II of Spain and Anne of Denmark were also included. If the paintings were produced as a set, they must have been acquired in 1603 or later, after James came to the throne. Like the Hardwick set, however, the series may have been made up of a combination of paintings acquired as separate objects, and small groups commissioned (or purchased) together. In addition to the royal portraits, Hare also owned paintings of foreign monarchs and other eminent figures. Among them were portraits of Francis I of France, Emperor Charles V, Mary Queen of Scots and Bishops Fox, Gardiner and Fisher, some of which may also have been purchased in groups.

The Dulwich Set (1618-20)

Edward Alleyn's set of royal portraits, now in the Dulwich Picture Gallery collection, originally comprised twenty-six paintings that were purchased in four groups between September 1618 and September 1620.⁵⁵⁶ The group commenced with a portrait of William I and included paintings of all the English monarchs up to and including James VI and I. The set also included a portrait of Edward, the Black Prince (the father of Richard II) and Anne Boleyn who was the only consort represented (probably due to a conventional overhang from the reign of Elizabeth I, Anne's daughter). Alleyn's

⁵⁵⁵ Turner's article includes a transcription of the list.

⁵⁵⁶ For details of the paintings see Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, pp. 23-31 and Vol. 2, Appendix 1, x, pp. 55-63.

acquisition of the set appears to have been inspired by the publication in 1618 of the *Baziliologia*, which also included portraits of Anne Boleyn and the Black Prince. As I have noted in Chapter 3, the *Baziliologia* also provided the designs for the earlier paintings in the set. It is unlikely that this was the only set of this size to be produced at this time, especially in the years following the publication of the *Baziliologia*, but it is the only example for which we have both surviving paintings and a contemporary record that details the extent of the original series.

Although only sixteen (possibly seventeen) portraits from the set are known to survive, details of Alleyn's payments recorded in his diary list the names of all the original sitters.⁵⁵⁷ It has been observed elsewhere that Alleyn paid for (and presumably received) portraits of the most recent sitters first.⁵⁵⁸ His first payment, made on 29 September 1618, was for portraits of James VI and I, Elizabeth, Mary, Edward VI, Henry VIII and Henry V. On 8 October, he paid for paintings of Edward III, Richard II, Henry IV, Henry VI, Edward IV, Edward V, Richard III and Henry VII. It was not until September 1620 that the set was completed: a payment was made for the portraits of Edward II, Edward I, Henry III, John, Richard I and Henry II on the 25th and, finally, for Henry I, Stephen, William I and William II, the Black Prince and Anne Boleyn five days later. It is perhaps significant that the two groups purchased in 1618 together make up the standard late-Elizabethan portrait set with the addition of Elizabeth I and James VI and I and it is probable that these paintings were acquired first because patterns for the portraits were readily available. As Foister has suggested, the short intervals in the purchase of the paintings in both 1618 and 1620 may have been determined by factors relating to payment or carriage.⁵⁵⁹ Alleyn might have commissioned all twenty-six paintings in 1618 and, for some reason, had to wait for the earlier portraits to be produced, or he might have returned to the shop or agent at a later date to commission

⁵⁵⁷ London, Dulwich College, Henslowe-Alleyn papers, MS 9, fols. 23^r, 23^v and 47^v. The surviving portraits are of William I, William II, Henry I, Henry II, Richard I, John, Edward I, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Richard III, Henry VII, Henry VIII, Anne Boleyn, Edward VI and Mary I. The possible seventeenth is a portrait of James VI and I, which, although it is believed to have come from the Alleyn bequest, is unlike the other portraits in the group and appears to have been cut down from a larger picture (Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p. 31). It is therefore unlikely that it was made as part of the group.

⁵⁵⁸ Gibson, 'A Jacobean Gallery', p. 10; Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings' in *Edward Alleyn*, ed. by Reid and Maniura, pp. 39-40 and Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p. 23.

⁵⁵⁹ Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 40.

the additional work. The cost of the portraits is unlikely to have been a significant factor in causing the hiatus. At 6s. 8d. each, the paintings were not expensive, especially in light of the fact that Alleyn paid £8 for tapestries in 1619.⁵⁶⁰

It is unlikely that the two-year wait was caused by the need to locate sources for the earlier paintings. The portrait of Henry IV, purchased in 1618, is clearly derived from the engraving in the *Baziliologia*; if this publication was available to use as a source in 1618, it is unlikely that it would have taken two years to develop portraits for the rest of the early sitters, most of which are derived from the same series. It is possible that Alleyn (or the workshop) acquired a copy of the *Baziliologia* portrait of Henry IV as a single-sheet engraving but, if so, the others in the series would probably have been relatively accessible. It is perhaps more likely, therefore, that Alleyn made the decision to extend his set at a later date for some reason unknown to us. However, the extant paintings purchased in 1620 do appear to have been conceived as a conscious extension of the series. The paintings are all approximately the same size and they all have a red or green curtain behind the sitter.

Both Foister and Ingamells have noted some differences in style between the 1618 and 1620 pictures, which, it has been suggested, could indicate that the two groups were produced in different workshops.⁵⁶¹ However, all the extant portraits share a similar palette and there are some notable stylistic similarities between those painted in 1618 and 1620. For example, an analysis of the painting technique used on four of the paintings from the set carried out at the NPG in 2011 revealed that thick paint was dragged over a dry surface to create texture in all four of the portraits (William I, Richard I, Henry VII and Anne Boleyn). In particular, this was seen clearly in the portraits of William I and Henry VII, purchased in 1620 and 1618 respectively. The four paintings also had other similarities including, for example, the use of a pale grey colour to block out the whites of the eyes. Underdrawing was also detected on all four pictures and can be seen on the surface of others, which indicates that patterns were used to produce the paintings. In IRR, small dots can be seen along the hairline and outline of the face in the portraits of Henry VII and Anne Boleyn, providing evidence

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 37.

⁵⁶¹ Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 42; Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p. 23.

that pouncing was used in these cases to transfer the patterns to the panels.⁵⁶² As pouncing marks are supposed to be invisible once the pattern has been transferred, it is very possible that the other patterns were transferred in the same way and then reinforced with underdrawing. Again, it is significant that the evidence of pouncing was seen on a portrait from 1618 and one from 1620. I would like to argue, therefore, that the 1620 paintings were produced in the same workshop as the 1618 group but probably by different artists. The apparent difference in style is due in part to the fact that engravings rather than paintings were used for the earlier pictures and, as such, the facial modelling in particular, appears quite different.

When Alleyn purchased his sibyls in November 1620, shortly after he completed his royal set, he made a payment to a 'Mr. Gibbkin' who, it has been suggested, might have been John Gipkin (1594-c.1629), the artist responsible for the painted diptych of Old St Paul's in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries.⁵⁶³ A few weeks later, Alleyn also paid 'Gibbkin' for gilding some pictures.⁵⁶⁴ It is probable that this man was John Gipkin although the nature of his involvement is unclear. Gipkin may have merely procured the paintings of sibyls on Alleyn's behalf. If he was involved either in their production or as an agent, it is probable that he was also involved with the set of kings and queens. However, the inferior quality of the painting in comparison to the Society of Antiquaries diptych makes it unlikely that he actually painted either set. As Foister has pointed out, Alleyn is likely to have known a number of painters through his work in the theatre where they would have been employed to produce props and sets. The Dulwich portraits have been painted rapidly in very bright colours and the panels, which are made from rather rough pieces of wood with a high incidence of knots, are prepared with little or no chalk ground which may indicate that they were produced by artists not trained in portrait painting.

Alleyn's acquisition of the royal portrait set and his sets of sibyls and apostles seems to have been part of a campaign to present himself as a man of taste and learning. Born in London, Alleyn worked as an actor from c.1583 and had gained a certain amount of

⁵⁶² Unpublished report at the NPG (MATB archive).

⁵⁶³ Dulwich College, Henslowe-Alleyn papers, MS 9, fol. 48^r; Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 39.

⁵⁶⁴ Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 39.

celebrity by the time he retired from the profession in c.1606.⁵⁶⁵ He was also something of an entrepreneur: in 1600, in partnership with his father-in-law, Philip Henslowe (c.1555-1616), the owner of the Rose Theatre, he built a new playhouse, The Fortune, north of the London Wall to capitalize on a new market.⁵⁶⁶ He also owned several public houses and, in 1604, gained the royal patent, along with Henslowe, for the Mastership of the Bears, Bulls and Mastiff Dogs, a lucrative and influential position.⁵⁶⁷ As S. P. Cerasano has argued, Alleyn was among a new class of upwardly mobile 'new men' who were able to raise their social status through business enterprises despite not being university-educated or being born into an elite family.⁵⁶⁸

By 1605/6, Alleyn was wealthy enough to be able to purchase a manor house at Dulwich, although he resided at Bankside until around 1612. In 1613 he founded the College of God's Gift at Dulwich, a charitable institution that was to include a schoolhouse, a chapel and twelve almshouses.⁵⁶⁹ Around the time Alleyn bought the first royal paintings, he was trying to obtain the Royal Patent for the foundation. Despite having already built a schoolhouse, a chapel and twelve almshouses and installed some of the resident poor scholars, brethren and sisters, the Royal Patent was difficult for him to acquire.⁵⁷⁰ The Lord Chancellor Francis Bacon, Baron Verulam of Verulam (1561-1626) initially opposed Alleyn's application, raising his objections in a letter dated 18 August 1618 to George Villiers, Marquess of Buckingham, whom Alleyn had entreated to further his cause.⁵⁷¹ Although Verulam approved of Alleyn's charitable endeavours, noting that he liked well that Alleyn 'playeth the last Act of his life so well', he did not approve of the proposal that the estate would be held in mortain, thereby depriving the crown of future revenue.⁵⁷² It was not until Alleyn had visited the Chancellor four times and paid numerous visits to the Attorney General, Sir Henry Yelveton (1566-1630) that the licence was eventually granted.⁵⁷³ Finally, after a year of campaigning, the patent

⁵⁶⁵ S.P. Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn: 1566-1626' in *Edward Alleyn*, ed. by Reid and Maniura, pp. 11-31 (p. 14).

⁵⁶⁶ Ibid, pp. 19-20.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid, p. 21.

⁵⁶⁸ Ibid, p. 11.

⁵⁶⁹ On the foundation of the college, see Jan Piggott, *Dulwich College: A History, 1616-2008* (London: Dulwich College, 2008), pp. 27-55.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid, p. 31.

⁵⁷¹ Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn: 1566-1626', pp. 24-25.

⁵⁷² *Letters of Sr Francis Bacon*, ed. by Robert Stephens (London: Tooke, 1702), p. 234.

⁵⁷³ Piggott, *Dulwich College*, pp. 31, 33; Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn: 1566-1626', p. 25.

was granted on 21 June 1619 and a grand foundation ceremony was held on 13 September 1619 with important men including the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Arundel and Inigo Jones (1573-1652), the King's Surveyor, in attendance.⁵⁷⁴

It is not known whether the royal portrait set was acquired to hang in Alleyn's own home or in the college. He appears to have recorded his expenses for his home and the college in his diary and we know that he was acquiring items for both at the same time.⁵⁷⁵ Foister has argued that the purchases are recorded as household expenses and were therefore originally intended for his home.⁵⁷⁶ They appear to have been hanging in the college, however, by 1626 when Alleyn bequeathed 'all the wainscots, hangings, pictures ... in the said college' to the institution.⁵⁷⁷ It is possible that Alleyn had seen similar displays at other educational and philanthropic institutions. As part of his research during the foundation of the college, he visited schools and 'hospitals' including Westminster, St Paul's, Winchester College, Merchant Taylors, Eton and Sutton's Hospital at the Charterhouse.⁵⁷⁸ His main reason was to study the statutes and syllabuses as well as details such as the catering arrangements, but he may also have gained inspiration from their didactic, decorative schemes. If the paintings were originally installed in the college, they are most likely to have been displayed in the long gallery which was on the first floor in the west of the building.⁵⁷⁹ In 1673, the royal set may have been among the 'several worthless Pictures' seen there by John Aubrey (1626-1697) during his 'Perambulation of Surrey'.⁵⁸⁰ The set was certainly there in 1726 when Vertue saw portraits of 'the Kings of England from Will^m. Conq to King Charles first. Poorely done' and 'the Black Prince with a Spear in his hand...'.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷⁴ See John Stow, *Annales, continued and augmented by Edward Howes* (London: R. Meighen, 1632), pp. 1032-33 for an account.

⁵⁷⁵ Piggott, *Dulwich College*, p. 29; Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 37.

⁵⁷⁶ Foister, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings', p. 59, n. 2.

⁵⁷⁷ On the bequest, see Ingamells, *Dulwich Picture Gallery*, p. 19.

⁵⁷⁸ Cerasano, 'Edward Alleyn: 1566-1626', p. 24 and Piggott, *Dulwich College*, p. 33.

⁵⁷⁹ Piggott, *Dulwich College*, p. 40.

⁵⁸⁰ John Aubrey, *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*, 5 vols, (London: E. Curll, 1719), I, p. 195.

⁵⁸¹ 'Vertue II', p. 13. The portrait of Charles may have been an addition to the set.

Hever Castle, Kent (after 1618)

Little is known about the partially extant royal portrait set now at Hever Castle, Kent.⁵⁸² Eight paintings remain, all of which are based on the engravings in the *Baziliologia*, but it is probable that the set originally consisted of portraits of all the English monarchs from William I. Those that survive represent William II, Henry II, John, Edward I, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI and Edward VI. Dendrochronology has provided a *terminus post quem* for the set of 1609 but as the portraits are based on the *Baziliologia* engravings, it is likely to have been produced in 1618 or later.⁵⁸³ Stylistically, the paintings are very similar and it is clear that they were produced as a group. The portrait of William II is notably wider than the other paintings, the majority of which have been painted on single boards. It is probable that the paintings were originally set into wainscot and therefore possible that this difference in size was determined by the spaces in the panelling. The original provenance of the paintings is not known but during the eighteenth century they were owned by Matthew Robinson, 2nd Baron Rokeby (1712-1800) at Mount Morris near Canterbury. The portraits provide further evidence that the *Baziliologia* was used as a standard source for royal portrait sets after its publication and therefore strengthen the argument that all the paintings in the Hornby Castle set were produced before this time.

Possible Lost Sets

The sets discussed in this chapter are likely to represent a relatively small proportion of the number of royal sets that were made under Elizabeth and James. Tantalizing glimpses of other possible examples can occasionally be found in documentary sources. For example, the acquisition of seven paintings of kings and queens of England is recorded in the account book of John Bridgeman (c.1577-1652), a future bishop of Chester, for the year 1616.⁵⁸⁴ At the same time Bridgeman commissioned portraits of himself and his wife and purchased a number of other

⁵⁸² *Lost Faces*, ed. by Grosvenor, pp. 104-107, no. 24 and Vol. 2, Appendix 1, xi, pp. 64-65.

⁵⁸³ *Lost Faces*, ed. by Grosvenor, p. 105.

⁵⁸⁴ Stafford, Staffordshire Record Office MS D1287/3/1, p. 145. Bridgeman paid 35 shillings altogether for the seven royal paintings. I am grateful to Simon Healy for drawing my attention to this reference. Peter David Yorke, 'Bridgeman, John (bap. 1577, d. 1652)', *ODNB* (OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2010) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3391>> [accessed 30 June 2014].

pictures and maps. He had recently been granted a lucrative rectory in Wigan, Lancashire through royal patronage so it is probable that he acquired the paintings to mark his change in fortunes and to commemorate this act of royal favour. Another probable set was recorded in an inventory of Stow Hall, Suffolk, taken in the 1620s records '21 halfe pictures of Kings and Queens' in the parlour.⁵⁸⁵ In 1722, Vertue saw 'Pictures of the Kings of England from K. Richard the 2^d to Queen Elisabeth when young. collected by S^r. W. Mildmay. done in pannels fixt in frames to the Wainscot' at Danbury Place, Essex, the home of William Fytch (Fitch) (c.1671-1728).⁵⁸⁶ Sir Walter Mildmay previously lived at the house and died in 1589 so if Vertue's report was accurate this is likely to have been an Elizabethan set. Danbury Place has since been pulled down and the paintings may have been destroyed at this time. A group of eleven portraits of kings, probably also dating from the late sixteenth century, was lost in a fire at Thorndon Hall, Essex in 1878.⁵⁸⁷ These portraits may have come to Thorndon from Ingatestone where they probably hung in the long gallery.

Conclusions

Although royal portrait sets do not survive in great numbers, a significant proportion of extant easel sets from this period represent English kings and queens. In addition, there are many more paintings that correspond to those in royal sets that survive as individual objects (as Appendix 2 shows) so it is probable that the fashion for this type of decoration was much more widespread than the surviving examples would indicate alone. It is difficult to know if there are any sets that survive intact as there are so few records. The Ripon set, which includes all the monarchs from Edward III to Mary I (excluding Edward V), plus a number of consorts, may be the only one. Although there are variations between different royal sets, there are also a number of similarities that indicate all of the examples discussed in this chapter were made in a relatively short space of time. For example, the same portrait types are generally used across the sets and most of the paintings are approximately the same size (around 22 x 17 inches). Although some royal portrait sets may have been made for specific locations, like the Weston set, it is probable that most were available to buy readymade

⁵⁸⁵ BL, Harley MS 70, f. 80^v.

⁵⁸⁶ 'Vertue I', p. 106.

⁵⁸⁷ HAL, 'Notes on Collections: Ingatestone, Essex'.

or to order to a standard format. However, it seems likely that patrons were able to choose which figures were included in their sets so that if they wished, they could tailor their royal sets to their own personal histories.

Chapter 5

Galleries of Fame, 1590s-1625

As the sixteenth century progressed the market for both painted and printed portraits expanded. By the 1590s, portrait engravings were becoming increasingly accessible in England and painted portraits of famous figures were available to buy relatively inexpensively either by commission or ‘off the peg’ in London.⁵⁸⁸ As we have seen, in 1599 William Cavendish (1551-1626) purchased at least twenty-seven pictures in the capital to take back to Derbyshire to hang in Hardwick New Hall and Edward Alleyn purchased at least fifty-two individual panel portraits between 1618 and 1620.⁵⁸⁹ The booming trade in both printed and painted portraits meant that likenesses of famous figures became increasingly standardized through repetition and recognition, and standard types developed for a greater number of people. We have seen, for example, that as the fashion for royal portrait sets developed, canonical likenesses were developed for pre-fifteenth-century kings and queens for whom recognizable portrait types had not previously existed. In addition, as members of the upper middle classes and civic institutions began to acquire portraits more frequently from the 1560s onwards, images of famous contemporaries, as well as historical figures, would have become more familiar to a greater proportion of the population.

The wider availability of authentic, or at least widely accepted, portrait types for a greater number of people meant that by the end of the sixteenth century, larger and more ambitious portrait sets began to be commissioned. The Weston set, for example, included not only the portraits of English royal sitters, but also portraits of foreign rulers, English statesmen and key political and military figures from elsewhere in Europe. More ambitious still was a set made for Thomas Sackville, 1st Baron Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset (1535/36-1608) at Knole in Kent, that may have included as many as fifty-two portraits of primarily sixteenth-century worthies from England and the continent. The figures represented in these sets were not necessarily chosen because they were personal heroes, but because they had each played a significant role in

⁵⁸⁸ On the trade in prints see Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart Britain*, p. 14; for evidence that painters were selling portraits on the streets, see Strong, *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁸⁹ White, ‘Hardwick Hall’, I, p. 170; Dulwich College MS 9, 23^{r-v}, 47^v, 49^r.

England's recent history, good or bad. They were 'galleries of fame' that not only commemorated illustrious figures but which also brought together a 'collection' of 'true' likenesses, gathered from a variety of sources. In this chapter I will examine the examples from Weston and Knole in an effort to understand why this type of set was made, how it was produced and where it was displayed.

The Weston Set

The Sitters

The Weston set was probably commissioned by Ralph Sheldon (*d.* 1613) in around the first half of the 1590s.⁵⁹⁰ In addition to the English royal portraits discussed in Chapter 4, the set included paintings of French royal figures (Francis I, Catherine de Medici (1519-1589), Henry III (1551-1589, reigned 1574-89) and Henry IV),⁵⁹¹ the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, English courtiers and statesmen (Wolsey, Thomas Cromwell, Thomas More and the 2nd Earl of Essex) and foreign military leaders (Fernando Álvarez de Toledo (1507-1582), 3rd Duke of Alva; Lamoral, Count of Egmont (1522-1568); an unidentified 'Duke of Guise' and Alexander Farnese (1545-1592), Duke of Parma). There are no known records of the set at Weston before 1737 when it was seen there by Vertue, but the unusual size and shape of the panels and the fact that they were integrated into a frieze within the house makes it highly likely that they were made for this location.⁵⁹²

It is possible that the set originally included more paintings than the twenty-two that were sold in 1781. Weston was demolished in *c.* 1826 but accounts of the room in which the paintings were displayed indicate that it was a large space. Known as the great Drawing Room in 1781, Vertue referred to it as the 'great room' and Loveday called it

⁵⁹⁰ The evidence that the set was made around this time is outlined in Chapter 4, pp. 111-112. For more information about the paintings, see Vol. 2, Appendix 10, pp. 223-35.

⁵⁹¹ *Weston Park Sale*, p. 37, lots 33, 35-37. The portrait of Francis I is described in the sale catalogue only as 'Francis King of Franca' but John Loveday recorded seeing a portrait of 'Francis I of France' with the set in 1747 (Markham, p. 538). Lot 36 was a portrait of 'Henry King of France', which is more likely to have been a portrait of Henry III than Henry II as it is situated in the chronological list between the portrait of Catherine de Medici (described as the 'Queen Mother of France') and 'Henry of Bourbon King of France', presumably Henry IV.

⁵⁹² 'Vertue IV', p. 140.

the ‘Great Parlour’.⁵⁹³ If the scale of Henry Shaw’s engraving of the upper end is accurate, the ceiling would have been around 17 foot high (5.18 metres) (figure 33).⁵⁹⁴ Vertue noted that the paintings were almost all around the room and Shaw described the frieze as ‘a continued succession of portraits’ so, given the apparent size of the room, it seems likely that the paintings sold in 1781 formed only part of the original set.⁵⁹⁵ Both Vertue and Shaw listed portraits with the set that were not included in the sale, namely paintings of the ‘Queen of Scots’ (Vertue) and ‘The Lord Chancellor Wriothesley’, ‘the Duke of Suffolk’, ‘the Lord Admiral’, ‘Lord Arundel’, the Bishop of Ely and Katherine Parr (Shaw).⁵⁹⁶ Shaw was writing after the paintings had been sold so his account may not be accurate, but it remains possible that some of the additional figures mentioned by him were originally represented in the set.

There are also signs in the engraving published by Shaw that the set may have been bigger (figure 33). There are recognizable likenesses of Elizabeth of York, Henry VIII and Wolsey among the paintings depicted in the frieze, portraits of all of whom were listed with the set in 1781, but there are also portraits apparently representing sitters not included with the set at that time. For example, the second portrait from the left resembles the standard painting of Francis Walsingham and the sitter to the left of Henry VIII is shown holding a seal bag, which may indicate that it is a portrait of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal under Elizabeth I. I have been unable to trace the origin of the engraving so it is difficult to assess its accuracy but there are indications that it is not a faithful representation. It seems unlikely, for example, that the portrait of Elizabeth of York did not hang beside the portrait of Henry VII and with the other English royal figures. In addition, the portrait of Henry VIII shows the king holding a sword, which does not correspond to the description of the Weston painting given in a sale catalogue in 1824 in which the king was described as holding a glove in his right hand and resting on a green table.⁵⁹⁷ This image of the frieze seems, therefore, to have been produced by someone who did not see the paintings *in situ* but who had some information about the display. The artist may have made his drawing of the room

⁵⁹³ Ibid and Markham, *John Loveday of Caversham*, p. 538.

⁵⁹⁴ The size of the paintings in the engraving compared to the surviving panels indicates that the scale is relatively accurate.

⁵⁹⁵ ‘Vertue IV’, p. 140; Shaw, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 13.

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁷ Rodd, *A Catalogue of Authentic Portraits*, p. 21, no. 59.

after the paintings had been taken down but while the panelling and the rest of the elements in the frieze, were still in place. Portraits of both Bacon and Walsingham were hanging elsewhere in the house in 1781 so the artist may have mistakenly assumed that they had originally been part of the set.⁵⁹⁸

The Portrait Sources

The sources for the extant royal paintings have been discussed in detail in Chapter 4.⁵⁹⁹ All are derived from paintings in the Royal Collection. The only other painting from the set known to survive is the portrait of Wolsey, which is now in the NPG collection. It is a version of the standard portrait type of Wolsey in which he is depicted in profile, dressed in cardinal's robes and holding a scroll.⁶⁰⁰ The type is of uncertain origin but it was probably developed during his lifetime. Infra-red reflectography carried out at the NPG has revealed that a traced pattern was used to transfer the design to the panel so it is probable that the immediate source was another painting.⁶⁰¹ A photograph of the portrait of the 2nd Earl of Essex (the whereabouts of which was known until relatively recently) published in 1969 indicates that it, too, was copied from a painting.⁶⁰² The painting appears to have been derived from an *ad vivum* likeness by William Segar (c.1564-1633). The head and collar are similar (in reverse) to a painting of Essex by Segar now at the National Gallery of Ireland, which was in the Lumley collection in 1590.⁶⁰³ The Lumley painting is inscribed with the date 1590 so if it was an original composition the Weston set cannot have been painted before this date. However, as David Piper has pointed out, Lumley is known to have commissioned copies of other paintings for his collection and it is therefore conceivable that the type was developed in the 1580s.⁶⁰⁴ Another version of the type in which Essex is depicted

⁵⁹⁸ *Weston Park Sale*, pp. 21, 33, lots 8 and 15.

⁵⁹⁹ Chapter 4, pp. 109-111.

⁶⁰⁰ Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, pp. 334-36.

⁶⁰¹ MATB database, forthcoming: NPG 32.

⁶⁰² Strong, *The English Icon*, p. 120, figure 180. The portrait was formerly in the possession of the Earl of Jersey and may have perished, along with the portrait of Arthur, in a fire after the Earl's move from Middleton Park.

⁶⁰³ NGI.283. On this portrait see David Piper, 'The 1590 Lumley Inventory: Hilliard, Segar and the Earl of Essex - II', *Burlington Magazine*, 99: 654 (1957), 298-301+303.

⁶⁰⁴ *Ibid*, p. 300; McLeod et al, 'The Portraits', p. 63.

facing the same way as he is in the Weston portrait, is believed to have come from Chavenage House, Gloucestershire.⁶⁰⁵

Location and Display

Although the engraving published by Shaw may not have been an accurate portrayal of the paintings in the frieze, there is evidence to suggest that it provides a good impression of how they were displayed. According to Shaw's text, the room was panelled throughout and the 'rich and singular frieze' was 'supported by lengthened and tapering Ionic pilasters, on high pedestals'.⁶⁰⁶ The engraving shows each picture set beneath an arch and flanked by either terms or full-length carved figures. A photograph of the portraits of Henry V and Edward IV after they had entered the collection at Knebworth, appears to correspond with the arrangement depicted in the engraving (figure 34). Published in 1906, the photograph shows the paintings set into the overmantle in the Old Drawing Room at Knebworth, framed by sections of panelling that closely resemble the arches depicted in the engraving.⁶⁰⁷ The panelling is not known to survive (the portraits are now displayed in gilt frames in the Banqueting Hall) and the absence of records detailing the acquisition of the paintings means we cannot be certain that it came from Weston, but the correlation between the engraving and the photograph makes it likely that the paintings were sold in this framework. The design of the frieze, as represented by the engraving, is reminiscent of the upper frieze on the carved oak screen made for the Middle Temple Hall in 1574 which also has a series of arches punctuated with carved figures.⁶⁰⁸ Sheldon attended the Middle Temple in the mid-1550s and may have been inspired by the elaborately carved screen on a subsequent visit.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁵ The Chavenage portrait is now at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (accession no. 44.621).

⁶⁰⁶ Shaw, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 13.

⁶⁰⁷ Published in *Country Life*, 14 April 1906.

⁶⁰⁸ The date of the screen is traditionally given as 1574 but Mark Girouard has suggested that its different sections may have been made at different times (Mark Girouard, 'The halls of the Elizabethan and early Stuart Inns of Court' in *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court* ed. by Archer et al, pp. 138-156 (p. 149)).

⁶⁰⁹ See Turner, 'Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon' (online) for details of his education and training.

If the room was as large as Shaw's engraving indicates, the paintings would have been displayed at a considerable height. This would account for the large yellow inscriptions on the surviving paintings, which were probably designed to be legible from afar. An analysis of the pigments used for the portrait of Wolsey carried out at the NPG in 2010 revealed that the letters were applied using lead tin yellow and covered, or at least highlighted, with gold leaf (figure 35). It appears, therefore, that the inscriptions, all of which are painted on dark-coloured backgrounds, were designed to be clearly visible even at 17 feet. A portrait of Ralph Sheldon painted by Hieronimo Custodis (active c.1589-92) in 1590 has an inscription in similar-style lettering, which may provide further evidence that the frieze was produced around this time.⁶¹⁰

The frieze of sibyls and prophets at Chastleton is perhaps the only frieze of individual paintings on panel from the period that remains *in situ* (figure 11). However, there is evidence to suggest that other sets discussed in this thesis were also displayed in this way. For example, Shoberl's nineteenth-century description of Bishop Sherborn's heroines of antiquity indicates that the set may have been set beneath the cornice at Amberley Castle and according to Thomas Fuller (1607/8-1661), the portraits of benefactors at Peterhouse College, Cambridge were fixed into the upper tiers of the wainscot. Other sets that were almost certainly set into panelling, probably at the upper levels, include the earls of Chester at Hooton Hall, the kings and queens at the Merchant Taylors' Company Hall and Danbury Place and the royal set now at Hever Castle. Other portraits sets are likely to have been displayed up high, even if not all were set into panelling. The bright colours, gilded areas and crude linear style of paintings such as the early kings in the Hornby set and the Dulwich sets, indicate that some sets were designed to be viewed from a distance.

The concept of a portrait frieze of individual panel paintings probably came to England from the continent. As we have seen, the Medici copies of Giovio's portraits were displayed as a frieze in both the Palazzo Vecchio and the Uffizi. In addition, as early as the 1360s, the Sala del Maggior Consiglio in the ducal palace in Venice had a series of paintings depicting former doges set beneath the cornice.⁶¹¹ By at least the early

⁶¹⁰ The portrait is now in the collection of Warwickshire Museum Service (no. 1989/99).

⁶¹¹ Martindale, *Heroes, Ancestors, Relatives*, pp. 25-29. The paintings of doges were destroyed in a fire in 1577 but replacements were painted in the late sixteenth century.

seventeenth century it had become conventional to display portraits in this way in the Netherlands. Writing to Sir Robert Carr in 1613, William Trumbull, the English agent in Brussels, made the following observation:

... the fashion of this country is not to lett there tapistry touch the rooffe or ground of their roomes: but to leave a space above to hang pictures: and underneath the length of a foot or a foot and a halfe to keepe them from harme when the roomes are made clean.⁶¹²

It is possible that the portrait frieze at Weston was directly influenced by examples on the continent. According to the epitaph composed by his son that was placed above his tomb in Beoley church, Ralph Sheldon ‘visited France and other countries’ and it is conceivable that he first saw a portrait frieze on one of these trips.⁶¹³

Shaw described the room at Weston where the paintings were displayed as panelled throughout.⁶¹⁴ When Vertue visited in 1737, the room was hung with Sheldon’s famous set of four tapestries depicting maps of the Midlands counties.⁶¹⁵ Sheldon’s father William (c.1500-1570) had left provision in his will for a tapestry workshop to be set up at the family manor of Barcheston, Warwickshire, to encourage the production of Flemish-style tapestries in England. It is not known if the maps at Weston were woven in Barcheston or if they came from a London workshop, but either way they no doubt served as a showcase for the family’s involvement in this industry. The tapestries were commissioned for Weston in around 1588 but it is not known where they were originally displayed. Turner has suggested that they may have been made for the hall but it is possible that Vertue saw them in their original setting. Sheldon’s tapestry maps depicted the counties in which he owned land and in which he had held political office.⁶¹⁶ A decorative programme that incorporated the tapestries and the portrait set could have been intended to locate Sheldon’s local achievements within a wider national narrative.

⁶¹² TNA SP 77/10, f. 352, dated 5 November 1613 (quoted in Turner, ‘Glimpses of a gallery’ (forthcoming, not yet paginated)).

⁶¹³ Turner, ‘Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon’.

⁶¹⁴ Shaw, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture*, p. 13.

⁶¹⁵ ‘Vertue IV’, p. 140. On the Sheldon tapestries, see Bate and Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World*, pp. 61-62.

⁶¹⁶ He had been Knight of the Shire of Warwickshire in 1563 and Sheriff of Worcester in 1576.

Sheldon's 'Goodly Shew'

It is probable the portraits of English monarchs in the frieze at Weston were intended as a conscious show of loyalty to the Crown. For the same reason, each of Sheldon's tapestry maps was emblazoned with the royal arms.⁶¹⁷ It has been argued that Sheldon's political career had been hampered by his apparent adherence to Roman Catholicism.⁶¹⁸ In 1557, under Mary I, he had married Anne, the daughter of Sir Robert Throckmorton of Coughton Court, whose family was staunchly Catholic. Under Elizabeth, Sheldon was investigated a number of times and briefly incarcerated in the Marshalsea prison in 1580. He was forced to pay recusancy fines from the late 1580s and in 1594 he was accused of being involved in a Catholic plot to kill the queen.⁶¹⁹ After the latter incident, his cousin, Sir John Harington (c.1560-1612), hinted that Sheldon was held back by his religion: 'I heard one that was a great courtier say that he thought [Sheldon] one of the sufficientist wise men ... fittest to have been made of the Council, but for one matter'.⁶²⁰ It is probable, therefore, that the portraits of Elizabeth's ancestors were commissioned by Sheldon in an attempt to protest his loyalty.

Sheldon's motivations for including the other sitters are more difficult to deduce but his choices were clearly influenced by the sources available.⁶²¹ The portraits in the set were all of well-known figures for whom likenesses would have been easy to locate, at least in London where the paintings were probably made.⁶²² But there may also have been some more personal reasons for his selection. For example, the mention of his visit to France on his epitaph could signify a particular interest in the country and it may be for this reason that a significant proportion of those represented were French. Primarily, however, the set seems to have been commissioned more for its function as a symbol of status. At a time when antiquarianism was increasingly fashionable among the elite, a set of paintings referencing not only the nation's history but also the owner's

⁶¹⁷ Bate and Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World*, p. 61.

⁶¹⁸ Thorpe and Davidson, 'SHELDON, Ralph' (online).

⁶¹⁹ Ibid and Turner, 'Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon' (online).

⁶²⁰ Quoted by Thorpe and Davidson, 'SHELDON, Ralph' (online).

⁶²¹ For details of contemporaries who are known to have owned portraits of each sitter, see Vol. 2, Appendix 10, pp. 223-35.

⁶²² Sheldon's account books show that he travelled to London around three or four times a year around the time the paintings were produced (Turner, 'Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon' (online)).

knowledge of specific ‘authentic’ portraits is likely to have impressed contemporary viewers. In his *Britannia*, Camden described Weston as ‘a faire house, which maketh a goodly shew [...] built by Ralph Sheldon for him and his Posterity’.⁶²³ Sheldon’s portrait set was an element of this ‘goodly shew’ as were his tapestries. Made at a time when his future must have seemed uncertain, the paintings were a tool in Sheldon’s campaign to secure his reputation and posthumous legacy.

The Knole Set

The Knole set was probably made around fifteen years after the Weston set. There are similarities between the two, most notably in the method of display, but the Knole set was grander, more ambitious and the choice of sitters was more nuanced and personalized. The remarkable survival of some of the paintings at Knole as well as elements of the early seventeenth-century decoration allows for a detailed analysis of the set and the context in which it was displayed. There are currently forty-four paintings in the set, which is now hanging in a first-floor corridor gallery known as the Brown Gallery (figure 36). The paintings are distinct from other portraits in the collection due to the decorative gilt spandrels that have been applied to the surface to form an oval around the sitter. They also have distinctive wooden frames, moulded in an egg-and-dart design, that have been nailed onto the front of the panels. In addition, carved wooden ribbons painted with each sitter’s name and title have been nailed to the top sections of the frames. The portraits are painted in oils on rectangular oak panels measuring approximately 31 ½ x 25 inches (80 x 63.5 cm).⁶²⁴ The spandrels have been applied in gold leaf with a white preparatory layer beneath, and the frames and ribbons have also been gilded. A vine-leaf design, applied by stencil, has been painted onto the spandrels in each corner in a red-brown colour that matches the paint used for the text on the ribbons.

The decorative spandrels and ribbons are clearly of a later date than the paintings and this is confirmed by documentary evidence. In May 1793 Francis Parsons (*d.*1804), a

⁶²³ William Camden, *Britain*, trans. by Philemon Holland (London: impensis George Bishop and John Norton, 1610), p. 365.

⁶²⁴ For more information about the paintings, see Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88. There is some variation in size but among those paintings known to be in the original set, this is by no more than around 2 ½ inches either side of the dimensions given.

portrait painter and picture restorer, was employed by John Sackville, 3rd Duke of Dorset (1745-1799) for ‘cleaning & Repairing forty old portraits on Pannels’.⁶²⁵ He also mended the frames, added ‘new Gilt’, painted the ‘Angle’ of each with ‘ornaments’ and attached ribbons to the frames ‘label’d with the name and title of each portrait’. It is clear, therefore, that the ribbons and spandrels as they now appear, date from this time. Because of this later intervention and a lack of documentary evidence about the provenance of the paintings, it has not hitherto been known for certain whether or not the portraits were made together as a set, or how they were originally displayed. New evidence presented here, however, reveals that thirty-eight of the surviving paintings were produced *en bloc* probably in the first decade of the seventeenth century. It is therefore likely that the paintings were commissioned by Thomas Sackville, 1st Baron Buckhurst and 1st Earl of Dorset (1535/36-1608), who lived at Knole from January 1603/4 until his death. Sackville substantially remodelled Knole between 1605 and 1608; there is evidence to suggest that the set was commissioned as part of a decorative scheme for the room now known as the Cartoon Gallery, which was completed in c.1608.⁶²⁶

Historiography

In 1728 Vertue visited Knole and observed ‘a small gallery hung with Old pictures. [*sic*] on bord all alike in size & ornament’.⁶²⁷ He listed a total of thirty-seven sitters depicted in the set, which, for the most part, correspond with the extant paintings.⁶²⁸ The documentary evidence for the set before 1728 is almost non-existent, but it is likely that the paintings were among the ‘Thirty two Heads’ in the Leicester Gallery and the ‘21. heads’ in the passage to the Leicester Gallery (the Brown Gallery space) recorded in an inventory in 1706.⁶²⁹ By the time Vertue visited, the majority of the paintings seem to have been moved to the space now known as the Brown Gallery.

⁶²⁵ Jacob Simon, ‘A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole, Kent’, 1998, revised 2013 www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/the-art-of-the-picture-frame/guides-knole and ‘British Picture Restorers, 1630-1950’ www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/directory-of-british-picture-restorers/british-picture-restorers-1630-1950-p [both accessed 31 March 2014].

⁶²⁶ Sackville’s remodelling of the house is the subject of a recent doctoral thesis (2010): Town, ‘A House ‘Re-Edified’’.

⁶²⁷ ‘Vertue II’, pp. 50-51.

⁶²⁸ For Vertue’s complete list and how it compares to the extant paintings, see Vol. 2, Table 9.

⁶²⁹ KHL MS U269/E/79/2, fol. 5^r.

At this time the gallery was partitioned into two rooms known as the ‘First Gallery’ and the ‘Horn Gallery’.⁶³⁰ The set almost certainly made up the bulk of the forty-three paintings recorded in the Horn Gallery in an inventory taken in 1730 and it is likely that this was the ‘small gallery’ in which Vertue saw the portraits.⁶³¹ The partition was still in place in 1765 when there were forty-five paintings in the Horn Gallery, but it had been removed by 1799 when the united space was first called the Brown Gallery.⁶³² In that year an inventory recorded ninety paintings in the room, listing each by description or sitter’s name. Forty-two of the paintings correspond to extant portraits in the set.⁶³³

The written evidence for the set having previously hung in the Cartoon Gallery rests solely on an unsubstantiated statement made by John Bridgman, the steward at Knole from at least 1794. In *An Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole*, first published in 1817, Bridgman wrote that the paintings ‘were formerly placed’ in the Cartoon Gallery.⁶³⁴ Large copies of cartoons by Raphael were brought to Knole from Copt Hall in Essex in 1700/1 and, according to Bridgman, it was at this point that the portraits were moved.⁶³⁵ In his book, Bridgman also listed the sitters in the set and included short biographies, borrowing heavily from the first published guide to the paintings by Henry Norton Willis that had appeared in print some twenty-two years earlier.⁶³⁶ Given Bridgman’s position at Knole, it is probable that his claim that the paintings were formerly in the Cartoon Gallery rested on oral testimony. However, the physical

⁶³⁰ Recently established by Emma Slocombe. A portrait of Philip, Count of Horn recorded in the Brown Gallery in 1799 may have given the room its name (KHLC MS U269/E5, fols 15-16 (fol. 17), photocopy in the HAL, ‘Notes on Collections: Knole’).

⁶³¹ KHLC MS U269, location unknown (transcription at Scotney Castle, Kent). At this time there were seven paintings in the First Gallery that could have included portraits from the set.

⁶³² KHLC MS U269/E4 and U269/E5. I am grateful to Emma Slocombe for sharing this observation.

⁶³³ See Vol. 2, Table 9.

⁶³⁴ John Bridgman, *An Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole in Kent; With a Brief Genealogy of the Sackville Family* (London: Lindsell, 1817), p. 18.

⁶³⁵ Copt Hall was inherited by Charles Sackville, 6th Earl of Dorset (1643-1706) from his mother, Lady Frances Cranfield. He sold the house in 1701 at which point many of the paintings and furnishings from the Cranfield collection were moved to Knole. Charles J. Phillips stated that the portraits in the set came from Copt Hall but there is no evidence to substantiate this claim (Charles J. Phillips, *History of the Sackville Family (Earls and Dukes of Dorset). Together with a description of Knole, early owners of Knole, and a catalogue raisonné of the pictures and drawings at Knole*, 2 vols, (London: Cassell, 1929), I, p. 480).

⁶³⁶ H.N. Willis, *Biographical Sketches of Eminent Persons whose portraits form part of the Duke of Dorset’s collection at Knole, with a brief description of the place* (London: Stockdale, 1795). For the sitters listed by Bridgman and Willis, see Vol. 2, Table 9.

evidence presented below, gathered from the paintings and the Cartoon Gallery itself, in which some of the early seventeenth-century decoration is intact, supports his assertion.

The Sitters

Among the extant paintings, the earliest sitters represented are the Franciscan friar and philosopher Roger Bacon (*c.*1214-92(?)) and the theologian and philosopher John Wyclif (*d.*1384). All the other sitters were alive in the sixteenth century. Only seven were still alive when Sackville died in 1608,⁶³⁷ but by this point they had all achieved fame and could qualify as ‘illustrious men’. Apart from Wyclif and Bacon, the English figures in the set represent the nation’s history throughout the sixteenth century and into the reign of James VI and I. The events of Henry VIII’s reign are represented by the figures of Wolsey, More, the earls of Essex and Surrey and the bishops John Fisher, Stephen Gardiner and Thomas Cranmer.⁶³⁸ The latter two also represent Mary I’s reign along with the soldier Sir James Wilford, and John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland represents Edward VI’s reign. Important mid-century figures in the set include William Herbert, 1st Earl of Pembroke, whose career spanned the reigns of Mary, Edward and Elizabeth, and Henry Fitzalan, 12th Earl of Arundel. The other sitters who represent Elizabeth’s reign are the Earl of Leicester; Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd Earl of Sussex; Burghley; Sir Christopher Hatton; Walsingham; the 4th Duke of Norfolk; Sir John Norris; Sir Francis Drake; Sir Walter Mildmay and Archbishop John Whitgift. Sackville himself is included along with other figures that were prominent under Elizabeth I and in the early years of James’s reign, namely Charles Howard, 1st Earl of Nottingham; Thomas Egerton, Baron Ellesmere; Thomas Howard, 1st Earl of Suffolk and the Earl of Salisbury. Finally, Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury and Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton both came to prominence after James acceded to the throne (but before 1608).

The preponderance of members of the Howard family among the sitters has led to the suggestion that the core of the set was brought to Knole by Lady Margaret Howard

⁶³⁷ Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury (*d.*1610); Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury (*d.*1612); Henry Howard, Earl of Northampton (*d.*1614); Henry I, Duke of Montmorency (*d.*1614); Thomas Egerton, then Baron Ellesmere (*d.*1617); Charles Howard, Earl of Nottingham (*d.*1624) and Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk (*d.*1626).

⁶³⁸ See Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88 for the sitters’ dates.

(c.1560-1591) in 1580 when she married Robert Sackville (1561-1609) (later 2nd Earl of Dorset) and subsequently added to.⁶³⁹ However, analysis of the wooden panels detailed below has revealed that with the exception of six later additions, the paintings currently in the set were produced together no earlier than 1605. Nevertheless, it is likely that the Howard alliance did have a bearing on the sitters included. Thomas Sackville's pride in the match and his consequent association with such a powerful and historically significant family is demonstrated by a richly illustrated pedigree that was made to celebrate the marriage, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.⁶⁴⁰ He may have been hoping to strengthen the alliance following Margaret's death in 1591.

There are also eight foreign sitters in the set, all of whom were famed military leaders involved in continental conflicts that affected English security and English foreign policy. Chronologically, they begin with Charles III, 8th Duke of Bourbon who was of French royal blood and was the premier peer in the realm under Francis I.⁶⁴¹ He was Constable of France between 1515 and 1521 but rebelled against the French king and fled the country to serve Emperor Charles V. He fought at the Battle of Pavia in 1525 and led the imperial troops in an assault on Rome in 1527, during which he was killed and the pope was taken prisoner. The Sack of Rome, as it is known, strengthened the Habsburgs at the expense of the papacy and was a shocking and sensational episode that altered the balance of power on the continent. The rest of the foreign figures represent the continental Wars of Religion that took place in the second half of the sixteenth century. They include William of Nassau, Prince of Orange (known as 'William the Silent'), the leader of the Dutch Revolt and the only foreign Protestant figure represented in the set. After his assassination in 1584 by a supporter of Philip II, it was feared in England that Elizabeth I would suffer a similar fate.⁶⁴² The other foreign sitters represent this Roman Catholic threat: three fought the Huguenots in France (Francis of Lorraine, 2nd Duke of Guise, his son Henry, 3rd Duke of Guise and Henry I, Duke of Montmorency) and the other two led the Spanish forces (John of Austria and Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma).

⁶³⁹ Alastair Laing, 'Knole: English, late 16th Century: the set of portraits of Famous Men in the Brown Gallery' (unpublished notes, 1996), HAL, 'Notes on Collections: Knole'.

⁶⁴⁰ Museum number MSL.41-1981.

⁶⁴¹ For a biography of Bourbon, see Vincent J. Pitts, *The Man Who Sacked Rome: Charles de Bourbon, Constable of France, 1490-1527* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994).

⁶⁴² Lisa Jardine, *The Awful End of Prince William the Silent: The First Assassination of a Head of State with a Handgun* (London: Harper Collins, 2005), p. 99.

The identity of the eighth foreign sitter is uncertain. The inscription on the ribbon identifies him as Alfonso d'Avalos, Marquis of Vasto (also written Guasto) and Pescara (1502-1546). Vasto was a Spanish-Italian *condottiero* who fought for the Spanish at Pavia and commanded the imperial forces in Italy under Charles V. As Alastair Laing has observed, however, the portrait, in which the sitter is depicted with a long white beard, appears to represent a man older than Vasto was when he died and does not correspond to known portraits of Vasto, who was painted by Titian.⁶⁴³ Laing has suggested that the Knoke painting might be a portrait of Fernando Alvarez de Toledo, 3rd Duke of Alva (1507-1582), leader of the Spanish forces in the Netherlands under Philip II.⁶⁴⁴ In England, those known to have owned portraits of him include Leicester, Lumley and Bess of Hardwick.⁶⁴⁵ In contemporary representations, Alva was depicted with a long, pointed and sometimes-bisected beard, similar to that in the Knoke portrait.⁶⁴⁶ However, the identification of the sitter as Alva is not wholly convincing: apart from the beard and the insignia of the Order of the Golden Fleece around the sitter's neck, the portrait does not closely resemble other known images of him. Furthermore, Laing's suggestion rests primarily on the fact that Vertue listed a 'Du. D'alva' with the set in 1728, but he also listed a 'Marquis of Past', probably an error for 'Marquis of Guast' as Vasto/ Guasto was commonly called in the sixteenth century and later.⁶⁴⁷ A late sixteenth-century painting of an unknown sitter still in the collection at Knoke has been erroneously inscribed with Alva's name and it is probably this portrait that Vertue saw.⁶⁴⁸ This portrait is painted on canvas and is smaller than the portraits in

⁶⁴³ Alastair Laing, 'Knoke: A Series of Historical Portraits' (unpublished notes, 1998), HAL, 'Notes on Collections: Knoke'. Portraits of Vasto by Titian are now at the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles (no. 2003.486) and in the Prado, Madrid (no. P00417).

⁶⁴⁴ Laing, 'Knoke: A Series of Historical Portraits', p. 11.

⁶⁴⁵ Elizabeth Goldring, 'Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I and the Earl of Leicester for Kenilworth Castle', *Burlington Magazine*, 147: 1231 (2005), 654-660 (p. 660); MacLeod et al, 'Appendix Three', p. 162 (Lumley owned Anthonis Mor's portrait of Alva) and Levey and Thornton, *Of Household Stuff*, p. 48 ('Duke Dolva').

⁶⁴⁶ For example, in an engraving by Christoffel van Sichem I after Philips Galle, made in 1601 and published as an illustration in Jean François Le Petit, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, trans. by Edward Grimeston (London: printed by A. Islip and G. Eld, 1608), p. 430 and in the woodcut portrait published in Paolo Giovio's *Elogia virorum bellica virtute illustrium* (Basel, 1575), p. 379.

⁶⁴⁷ 'Marquis of Guast' was used, for example, in Thomas Danett's *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the Eight* (London: Thomas Charde, 1600), Holinshed's *Chronicles* and Edward Grimestone's translation of *A generall historie of the Netherlands* (1608).

⁶⁴⁸ NTIN 129802.

the set so it is unlikely to be part of the original group but it appears to have been hanging in the Horn Gallery when Vertue saw the paintings.⁶⁴⁹

Vertue's identification of the portrait as the 'Marquis of Past' may indicate that the paintings were inscribed or labelled in some way before the ribbons were applied. If the picture was intended to represent *a* Marquis of Vasto, apart from Alfonso d'Avalos (*d.*1546), the most likely candidates are his cousin, Fernando Francesco d'Avalos (1489-1525), with whom he fought at Pavia and from whom he inherited his titles, or Alfonso's grandson, Alfonso Felice d'Avalos (1564-1593). All three were members of the Order of the Golden Fleece. The latter commanded the Duke of Parma's troops against the English at the battle of Zutphen, during which Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) was mortally wounded. However, all three sitters died young and I have been unable to find an image of any of them that corresponds with the portrait in the Knole set.⁶⁵⁰ The intended identity of this sitter, therefore, remains unclear.

Later Additions

In addition to the sitters discussed above, the set currently includes six portraits that were not part of the original group. Four of these paintings depict English monarchs (Henry VIII, Mary I, Elizabeth I and James VI and I), one is a portrait of George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland (1558-1605) and the other is a portrait identified on the ribbon as 'Admiral Blake'. The four monarchs have previously been disassociated from the original set on the basis of style and the fact that they are all absent from Vertue's list.⁶⁵¹ They were first grouped with the set in the 1799 inventory. The frames on these paintings are probably later replicas as they have slightly different proportions to those in the original group: the 'eggs' are slightly rounder, the corner leafs are larger, the 'darts' are more clearly defined and they have a slightly smoother appearance due to the fact they are in better condition (figures 37 and 38).⁶⁵² Given the fact that the monarchs

⁶⁴⁹ A portrait of the 'Duke of Alvarez' was listed in the Brown Gallery in 1799 and by Bridgman in 1817 but in neither case was it included with the set.

⁶⁵⁰ An engraving of Francesco in profile by Dominicus Custos (1600-04) is the closest (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam RP-P-1908-5348).

⁶⁵¹ Laing, 'Knole: A Series of Historical Portraits', p. 2.

⁶⁵² The sixteenth-century portrait triptych at Knole depicting five church reformers discussed in Chapter 1, p. 29 (which also hangs in the Brown Gallery) appears to have been framed at the same time as the additions to the set.

had been added to the set by 1799, it is probable that the replica frames were supplied by Parsons who was paid in 1793 for a new frame for a portrait of Queen Elizabeth and other unspecified work over the following years.⁶⁵³

The panels on which the portraits of Henry, Mary and Elizabeth are painted have been enlarged on all sides to make them the same size as the other portraits in the set (figure 39). In each case the painting has been extended to cover the additional sections of wood and the gilt spandrels and frame have been applied to the enlarged panel. Parsons may have been responsible for adapting the panels and painting the additional sections. All three portraits have been painted on oak and appear stylistically to date from the first half of the seventeenth century.⁶⁵⁴ The 1706 inventory lists three-quarter-length pictures of both Mary and Elizabeth in ‘the Passage Roome between the great Dining Roome and the Chappel’ and Laing has suggested that these paintings could have been cut down to provide the heads for these sitters.⁶⁵⁵ The portrait of Henry VIII is possibly identical to the picture recorded by Vertue as ‘K. Hen. 8. a head’ in an unspecified location in the house in 1728.⁶⁵⁶ The portrait of James is the only picture in the set on canvas. It is derived from the portrait of the king by Paul van Somer (c.1576-1621) and was probably painted between 1620 and 1625.⁶⁵⁷

In 1793 Parsons was also paid for supplying ‘one New Portrait’ of the Earl of Cumberland.⁶⁵⁸ This was almost certainly the picture of Cumberland currently in the set that has been painted on tropical hardwood, very seldom used in the seventeenth century (the original portraits have all been painted on Eastern Baltic oak).⁶⁵⁹ In addition, the painting has a replica frame that corresponds to those on the portraits of monarchs.⁶⁶⁰ In 1728, however, Vertue included a portrait of ‘Geo: Clifford Erl

⁶⁵³ Simon, ‘A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole’ (online).

⁶⁵⁴ Because of the extended sections, none of these panels were suitable for dendrochronology.

⁶⁵⁵ Laing, ‘Knole: A Series of Historical Portraits’, pp. 4, 6. Also, on a visit to Knole in 1731, Vertue saw a portrait of Mary I, ‘her face pretty good’ in an unspecified location in the house (‘Vertue IV’, p. 18).

⁶⁵⁶ Laing, ‘Knole: A Series of Historical Portraits’, p. 3.

⁶⁵⁷ For James VI and I’s iconography, see Strong, *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, I, pp. 178-80.

⁶⁵⁸ Simon, ‘A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole’ (online).

⁶⁵⁹ Ian Tyers, ‘The Tree-Ring Analysis of 22 of the 44 Panel Paintings in the Historical Portrait Set in the Brown Gallery, Sackville Collection, Knole’, Report 580 (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., March 2013) [hereafter Tyers, ‘Knole 2013’], p. 1.

⁶⁶⁰ Unlike the monarchs, Cumberland was not included in the 1799 inventory, but he was listed among the sitters in the set by Willis in 1795.

Cumberland' with the other paintings in the set, which may mean that the 'New Portrait' supplied by Parsons was a replacement for an earlier painting.⁶⁶¹ The first painting of Cumberland may have been part of the original group or it could have been added to the set in February 1609 when the sitter's daughter, Anne Clifford (1590-1676), married Richard Sackville, 3rd Earl of Dorset (1589-1624). Cumberland was an important courtier in Thomas Sackville's lifetime; he played a significant role in the campaign against the Spanish Armada in 1588 and was made queen's champion in 1590. He was therefore of sufficient status and fame to have been included in Sackville's original set.

Finally, the portrait identified as 'Admiral Blake' stands out from the rest of the group stylistically and appears to be slightly later in date. It is the only portrait in the set that includes a coat of arms and a view in the background (a naval scene). The inscription on the ribbon presumably refers to the famous English admiral, Robert Blake (c.1598-1657). In his *History of the Sackville Family* (1929), Charles J. Phillips questioned the identity of the sitter on the basis that the costume appears to be from an earlier date and suggested that the portrait might in fact represent Captain George Fenner (sometimes called Venour) (c.1540-1618).⁶⁶² This identification may have been based on the coat of arms, which has been associated with the Fenner family.⁶⁶³ Whoever he is, however, it is clear from the construction of the panel that this painting does not belong with the original set. The panels used for the thirty-eight original paintings have all been made from individual boards that have been joined using distinctive tongue-and-groove joints (figure 40).⁶⁶⁴ In contrast, the three boards that make up the 'Blake' panel have been connected using plain butt joints.⁶⁶⁵ Chipped paint can be seen at the bottom edge of the panel, which indicates that the portrait has been cut down from a longer painting.⁶⁶⁶ In contrast, the paintings in the original set appear not to have any paint beneath the frames

⁶⁶¹ 'Vertue II', p. 51.

⁶⁶² Phillips, *History of the Sackville Family*, II, p. 423.

⁶⁶³ The College of Arms have recently examined the picture and concluded that it probably belonged to the Fenner family: Richard Leathes, 'Farewell Admiral Blake: A long overdue welcome to Captain George Venour (Fenner)' (unpublished research, 2011). However, the naval scene and the coat of arms have been painted over the background and may therefore be later additions. Laing suggested that the portrait could represent Lord William Howard (1563-1640) whose name was among those listed by Vertue in 1728, but there is no evidence to substantiate this (Laing, 'Knole: A Series of Historical Portraits', p. 10).

⁶⁶⁴ Observation first made by Ian Tyers.

⁶⁶⁵ Tyers, 'Knole 2013', p. 52.

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid.

(figure 41). Also, the Blake panel has been dated by dendochronology to c.1610 or later, meaning it cannot have been commissioned by Thomas Sackville, unlike the paintings in the original group.⁶⁶⁷ A portrait of ‘Admiral Blake’ was recorded in the ‘First Gallery’ in the 1765 inventory, set apart from the rest of the set. By 1799 it had been incorporated into the group. The frame matches those on the other later paintings so it is likely that it, too, was added to the set in the 1790s.

The Availability of Sources

Like those at Weston, the portraits in the Knole set were all based on pre-existing sources. The fame of the sitters, and the fact that most were alive in the sixteenth century, meant that recognizable likenesses existed for the majority of the figures represented. Most were standard figures in late-Tudor and Jacobean portrait collections (see Table 8). At least nine were included in Parker’s collection at Lambeth Palace in 1575 and twenty-three were represented in Lumley’s collection in 1590.⁶⁶⁸ For commonly represented sitters such as Wolsey, Leicester, Burghley and Walsingham, portrait sources would have been readily available in the form of other paintings and engravings, and painters may have retained patterns of them in their studios.⁶⁶⁹ Although the set also includes sitters whose portraits have survived in much fewer numbers, such as Friar Bacon, Wyclif and James Wilford, it seems Sackville only included sitters whose likenesses were available. Wilford had become a national military hero for his role in the capture of Haddington in Scotland in 1548 and a poem published in 1557 entitled ‘Verses written in the picture of Sir James Wilford knight’ indicates that portraits of him were available soon afterwards.⁶⁷⁰ Lumley had a portrait of him in his collection in 1590 and a sixteenth-century version of the portrait at Knole survives at Coughton Court, Warwickshire.⁶⁷¹ A portrait of Wyclif was recorded in the

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁸ It is also notable that among the sitters missing from Lumley’s collection are the Protestant (and Proto-Protestant) figures of Wyclif, Northumberland and Cranmer.

⁶⁶⁹ For more information about the likely source for each portrait, see Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88.

⁶⁷⁰ Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey and others, *Songes and sonnettes* (London: apud Richard Tottel, 31 July 1557) (STC 13861), fol. 62^v.

⁶⁷¹ ‘The Inventory’, fol. 39^r in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans; NTIN 135561.

collection at Lambeth Palace in 1575 and a portrait of Friar Bacon at Essex House, London in 1596, which may have been acquired by the Earl of Leicester.⁶⁷²

Portraits of most of the foreign sitters are also known to have been included in other Tudor and Jacobean collections. There were portraits of Charles, Duke of Bourbon in Lumley's collection and possibly at Baynard's Castle in 1562 and at Whitehall in 1547.⁶⁷³ At Theobalds, Burghley had portraits of John of Austria and the Duke of Parma among his group of continental sitters.⁶⁷⁴ In addition, there is a surviving portrait of the Duke of Parma at Hatfield House.⁶⁷⁵ Lumley had a relatively large collection of portraits of foreign notables that included not only portraits of Bourbon and Alva, but also portraits of William the Silent, Henry of Guise and Parma. Some of these portraits may have been derived from imported prints or patterns brought into the country by émigré painters, but others were probably acquired while abroad or sent from overseas. In 1575, for example, Walsingham received a group of four portraits from Paris representing the late Charles IX of France, his wife Elizabeth of Austria and the 'Marshals Montmorency and Danville' (probably Francis, Duke of Montmorency (1530-79) and his brother Henry I, Duke of Montmorency, called Sieur de Damville (1563-1614)).⁶⁷⁶

The range of portrait sources available to the makers of the Knoke set means that the method of transfer probably varied. For the most commonly reproduced and the most current portraits, patterns taken directly from other paintings are likely to have been used. Evidence of this emerges when the paintings are viewed under infra-red light. The portrait of Nottingham, for example, who was still alive when the set was made, has very clear and confident underdrawing in the face, which indicates that a pattern has

⁶⁷² Sandys, 'Copy of the Inventory of Archbishop Parker's Goods', p. 11; Oxford, Bodleian Library, English History c.120 fol. 34.

⁶⁷³ 'The Inventory', fol. 39^v in *The Lumley Inventory*, ed. by Evans; Goldring, 'An Important Early Picture Collection', p. 160 ('The Duke of Burboine') and *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Vol. I*, p. 238 ('Duke of Bourbonne').

⁶⁷⁴ *The Diary of Baron Waldstein*, ed. by Groos, p. 85.

⁶⁷⁵ Auerbach and Adams, *Paintings and Sculpture at Hatfield House*, p. 64, no. 54. The portrait at Hatfield is derived from the same prototype as the painting at Knoke (a painting by Otto van Veen (1556-1629), c.1585-90) although there are differences in the costume. The van Veen portrait is in the Musées Royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels.

⁶⁷⁶ 13 July 1575, *Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 11: 1575-1577*, ed. by Allan James Crosby (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1880), no. 227 <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=73216>> [accessed 1 March 2014].

been used (figure 42). This portrait type was current from around 1600 and was probably fairly widely replicated given Nottingham's fame. The likeness corresponds closely to the portrait of Nottingham used for the painting commemorating the Somerset House Conference in 1604 (in which a portrait of Sackville was also included) and a contemporary version similar to the Knoke portrait survives in the Royal Collection.⁶⁷⁷ Patterns appear to have been used for other widely reproduced types including the portraits of Sussex, Hatton, Leicester and Sackville. A pattern for the latter is likely to have been taken directly from the three-quarter-length portrait attributed to John de Critz the Elder that survives in the Knoke collection.

In some cases, the artists may have had direct access to a painting from which they could not only trace a pattern, but also use as a guide for colour, costume and modelling. The portrait of William the Silent, for example, appears to have been copied from a painted version of the *ad vivum* portrait of the Dutch leader by Adriaen Thomas Key (c.1579).⁶⁷⁸ Unlike some of the other paintings in the set, the portrait closely follows the costume and colours of the prototype and as such must have been produced using more than just a traced pattern. The portrait of Bancroft also seems to have been copied from a painting; it is very close to other extant versions in the costume and facial modelling, in particular a version at Fulham Palace, London.⁶⁷⁹ In contrast, the painters appear to have produced some of the other portraits without immediate access to painted versions, which would account for differences in costume. For example, although the portrait of Sussex corresponds in the face to other contemporary versions, the costume in the Knoke portrait is quite different to the other paintings, which perhaps suggests that the painters only had access to a pattern of the head.⁶⁸⁰ Similarly, in the Knoke portrait, Wilford is shown in armour quite different to that in the earlier portrait at Coughton Court, although the head is very similar (figure 43).

Some paintings in the set, including the portraits of Wolsey and Fisher, were probably made using prints rather than paintings. The majority of the extant versions of the

⁶⁷⁷ NPG 665; RCIN 406188.

⁶⁷⁸ Two versions by Key survive, one in the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (SK-A-3148) and one in the Mauritshuis, The Hague (no. 225).

⁶⁷⁹ This is unlikely to be the other portrait of Bancroft that it in the Knoke collection which differs slightly both in the costume and the face.

⁶⁸⁰ Other versions of the portrait of Sussex are at Anglesey Abbey (NTIN 515575); Hardwick Hall (NTIN 1129155) and the NPG (NPG 105 and 312).

portrait of Wolsey show the sitter facing to the left whereas in the Knole version he is facing right and the proportions of the face in the Knole picture do not bear close comparison to other painted versions.⁶⁸¹ Furthermore, the underdrawing in the Wolsey picture (figure 44) is less assured than that seen in the portrait of Nottingham which appears to indicate that the painter did not use a traced pattern but sketched the design onto the panel free-hand, perhaps copying a smaller print or drawing. The portrait is similar to an engraving of Wolsey attributed to Magdalena de Passe or Willem de Passe that was published in Henry Holland's *Heroologia* in 1620 (figure 45). It is possible that this engraving was made at an earlier date and was used for the Knole painting, or that both derive from a common graphic source. Similarly, the portrait of Fisher more closely resembles printed portraits of the bishop rather than painted versions. Most extant paintings of Fisher, including versions at Trinity College, Cambridge and Christ's College, Cambridge are based on the portrait type developed by Holbein in c.1532-34 but engravings of him, including those published in Thevet's *Le Vrais Pourtraits* (Paris, 1584) and Philips Galle's *Virorum Doctorum de Disciplinis benemerentium Effigies XLIII* (Antwerp, 1572) use a related but slightly different type in which he is depicted facing the other way and with a slightly fuller face (figures 46 and 47).⁶⁸² The Knole portrait relates to these engravings.

The Date of the Set

As part of the research for this thesis, twenty-two of the portraits in the set (including 'Blake') underwent dendrochronological analysis over four days in July and September 2012 and January 2013.⁶⁸³ The number examined was determined by the time available, and the selection, in part, by the accessibility of the paintings. The aim, however, was to select a range of portraits from within different 'sitter categories' (for example, Henrician statesmen, bishops, continental figures) in order to address the possibility that the set could be a composite of a number of separately produced sub-sets. The results effectively ruled this out, strongly indicating that all thirty-eight of the

⁶⁸¹ For other known versions, see Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88.

⁶⁸² The Holbein drawing survives in the Royal Collection (RCIN 912205).

⁶⁸³ Ian Tyers, 'The Tree-Ring Analysis of 13 Panel Paintings from the Historical Portrait Set in the Brown Gallery, Sackville Collection, Knole', Report 566 (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., October 2012) and 'Knole 2013'. See Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88.

original panels were produced as a single commission. The evidence for this comes in part from the panel construction, in particular the use of tongue-and-groove joints mentioned above, but also from the fact that a number of the panels contained wood from the same tree as others not necessarily within the same 'sitter category'. For example, the portraits of Essex, Gardiner, William the Silent, Northampton, Nottingham, Francis of Guise and Salisbury (Group A) are all painted on panels that contain wood from the same tree. A second group was found to consist of the portraits of Surrey, Walsingham, Bourbon, Henry of Guise, Drake and John of Austria (Group B), the first four of which contain wood from one tree and last two, from a second tree that was also used to make the Walsingham panel. A third group of connected panels (Group C) includes the portraits of Norris, Sackville, Wilford, Mildmay, Bancroft and Montmorency. Finally, the Burghley and Friar Bacon panels were found to have a close correlation, possibly indicating that they, too, contain wood from the same tree. These connections provide strong evidence that all the panels examined were produced by the same joinery workshop as a single commission. The similarity in the construction of the panels across the set indicates that the panels that were not examined (with the exception of the additional six) were also part of this commission.

On the basis that the portraits were produced at the same time, the dendrochronology has also provided a *terminus post quem* for the set. The most recent tree identified (found in the Group B panels) cannot have been felled any earlier than 1605. If it was felled in this year or in 1606, however, it is entirely plausible that the set was made in 1607 or 1608. Apart from the portrait of 'Blake', all of the panels examined could have been produced by this date. There are also indications in the portraits themselves that the set was produced around this time. For example, the Earl of Salisbury, whose portrait is based on a type developed by John de Critz the Elder in around 1602,⁶⁸⁴ is depicted wearing a blue ribbon around his neck on which the lesser George would have been suspended (the George itself is not visible which may be the result of overpainting or abrasion). Salisbury was made a member of the Order of the Garter in 1606.⁶⁸⁵ Also, the inclusion of Bancroft, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1604, and no later archbishops, indicates that the set was produced before Bancroft's death in 1610.

⁶⁸⁴ The portrait of Salisbury by de Critz in the NPG is inscribed with the date 1602 (NPG 107).

⁶⁸⁵ Northampton, who was made a member of the Order in 1605 is not shown wearing the Lesser George. It is possible that this was an oversight - perhaps a failure to update an earlier source.

Location and display

By the 1590s, the display of portraits in galleries had become conventional. In Ben Jonson's 1602 play *Poetaster*, a husband tells his wife not to hang their pictures in the hall or the dining chamber 'but in the gallery only for 'tis not courtly else'.⁶⁸⁶ The Cartoon Gallery is situated on Knole's first floor within the suite of state apartments created as part of Sackville's remodelling between 1605 and 1608 (figure 48).⁶⁸⁷ Measuring around 92 ½ x 18 feet (27.43 x 5.48 metres) the room has variously been called the 'Rich Gallery' (by Parliamentary troops who sequestered the house during the Civil War),⁶⁸⁸ the 'Matted gallery' (in the 1706 and 1730 inventories, presumably because it was once lined with rush matting) and, according to Lionel Sackville-West, the 'Great Gallery'.⁶⁸⁹ Although the arrival of the Cartoons in 1700/1 significantly altered the appearance of the room, a substantial amount of the early seventeenth-century decoration survives including the plasterwork ceiling, the moulded cornice and architrave, some ornamental carving and painted canvas panels fixed onto the dado.⁶⁹⁰ The original polychrome scheme incorporated elements typical of early seventeenth-century English court fashions: classical pilasters and capitals, arabesques, painted allegorical figures and grotesques and heraldic symbols including carved Sackville leopards.

The moulded-plaster cornice, which runs around the room, has been decorated with a stencilled design of white and gold on a blue ground (figures 49, 50 and 51).⁶⁹¹ The frieze on the north and east walls has been obscured by a textile wall covering, probably installed when the cartoons arrived, but it is still visible on the south and west walls. In

⁶⁸⁶ Quoted in Mercer, *English Art*, p. 151.

⁶⁸⁷ For more detail about the history of the Cartoon Gallery and its decoration, see Dorian Church, 'The Cartoon Gallery, Knole' (unpublished MA dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1998).

⁶⁸⁸ Parliamentary inventory, 1645: KLHC U269/O10/1, transcription appended to Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified''.

⁶⁸⁹ Lionel Sackville-West, *Knole House: Its State Rooms, Pictures and Antiquities* (Sevenoaks: Salmon, 1906), p. 74.

⁶⁹⁰ See Church, 'The Cartoon Gallery'. An architectural paint study of the decoration carried out by the National Trust in 1997 confirmed that much of the original decoration survives, particularly in the areas around the cornice, frieze and architrave: Jongsma, D.E.R., 'Knole Cartoon Gallery: Architectural Paint Research' (unpublished report for the National Trust, 1998).

⁶⁹¹ Jongsma, 'Knole Cartoon Gallery', p. 29.

these areas, it is clear that the cornice brackets, placed around the room at intervals of approximately 29-33 inches (c.73.7-83.8 cm), served to define a series of rectangular spaces along the frieze that are each around 34 inches (c.86.4 cm) in height. If the frieze continues around the room, as is probably the case, the number of visible cornice brackets suggests that there are up to fifty-two of these spaces.⁶⁹² It is clear that they were originally intended to display a series of rectangular panels of some sort. There are currently twelve paintings on canvas of flower and fruit arrangements set into the spaces on the south and west walls and the east and west returns of the south bay window, but they do not fit comfortably and are unlikely to have been made for this location (figures 52 and 53). They are of a style popular in the Netherlands in the later seventeenth century and probably came to the house after Thomas Sackville's death.⁶⁹³ Emma Slocombe has suggested that they may be identical with the twenty-three Dutch paintings that entered the collection in 1696, as recorded by an inventory of items delivered to Knole and Copt Hall from the palaces of Kensington and Whitehall in that year.⁶⁹⁴ The existence of eleven flower and fruit paintings in the Sackville private collection, in addition to the twelve in the Cartoon Gallery, makes this very likely to be the case.

It is probable, therefore, that the portraits from the set were originally fixed into these spaces, each of which is large enough to hold one of the paintings plus its frame. The fact that there are up to fifty-two spaces in the room could indicate that the set was originally larger and that some of the paintings have been lost. The extant panels in the set all have holes on the backs that appear to indicate that they were nailed into place (figure 54). Some of the nails remain in the holes but in most cases, sections of the wood around the holes have been gouged out, presumably in the process of taking down the pictures (figures 55 and 56). None of the later additions bear these marks, which indicates that they relate to the display of the pictures prior to the late eighteenth century. Moreover, corresponding nail holes can also be seen along the frieze in the Cartoon Gallery (figure 57), above the flower paintings in some areas. If the portraits were fixed into the frieze in the mid-seventeenth century, it would explain why they

⁶⁹² Ten on the west side of the south wall, 15 on the east; 6 on the east wall; 6 on the east side of the north wall, 9 on the west and 2 at each side of the south bay; 1 at either side of the west bay window.

⁶⁹³ John Coleman, 'Mysterious Blooms', *Country Life*, 191: 6 (1997), 78-81 (p. 80).

⁶⁹⁴ KHLC U269/O69/1, fol. 2^r. I am grateful to Emma Slocombe for sharing this reference.

were not listed in inventories taken by parliamentary troops in 1645 and 1646, as the purpose of the inventories was to provide a list of moveable goods that could be readily sold.⁶⁹⁵ As ‘fixed’ decoration, the paintings would not have fallen into this category. This would also explain the unusual method of framing: if the panels were nailed into place, the frames were not needed to support the painting, but simply to provide decoration and a sense of uniformity. The current frames, which appear to be made from oak, were almost certainly made at the same time as the paintings and the lack of paint beneath them appears to suggest that they were fixed to the panels before the portraits were painted.⁶⁹⁶

There is evidence to suggest that the portraits were always in ovals although it is unclear how they originally looked. There can be little doubt that Parsons applied the gilt spandrels in 1793. Pigment analysis undertaken on the portraits of Burghley, Sussex and John of Austria appears to confirm this: a similar layer structure beneath the gilt spandrels and the gilding on the ribbons indicates that this work was carried out as part of the same campaign.⁶⁹⁷ In both areas, a thin layer of yellow-orange paint (probably made from finely ground yellow ochre particles) has been applied on top of a thick white ground layer.⁶⁹⁸ This yellow-orange layer can also be seen beneath the gilding on the frames indicating that they were also gilded (possibly re-gilded) at the same time (figures 58 and 59). There is no evidence to suggest that there was an earlier campaign of gilding beneath the spandrels. Yet feigned ovals of some sort do appear to have been part of the original design. In 1737, Vertue described the portraits in the set as ‘old pictures on board Ovals’ and a number of engraving of portraits from the set that pre-date Parsons’ intervention include ovals.⁶⁹⁹ For example, a mezzotint of the portrait of

⁶⁹⁵ Town, ‘A House ‘Re-Edified’’, p. 217. Many of the pictures and furnishings in the house were forcibly sold at this point although some were bought by the family and returned to Knole at a later date.

⁶⁹⁶ Oak was commonly used for frames before the mid-seventeenth century (Simon, ‘A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole’ (online)).

⁶⁹⁷ Paint sampling for this research was carried out by Caroline Rae at the NPG in September 2013: Caroline Rae, ‘Sampling of three portraits from Knole House’ (unpublished paint sampling report, 2013). I am grateful to the NPG and the National Trust for supporting this analysis.

⁶⁹⁸ Samples taken from the ribbon and the bottom right spandrel on the John of Austria painting confirm this layer structure (Rae, ‘Sampling of three portraits’, pp. 1, 4). Photomicroscopy has indicated that the yellow/ orange layer was also present beneath the gilding on the other paintings.

⁶⁹⁹ ‘Vertue IV’, p. 123.

Wyclif made by George White (c.1684-1732) between 1710 and 1735, depicts the sitter in an oval, in a composition relatively faithful to the Knole painting (figure 60) and engravings made in the 1780s of the portraits of Friar Bacon, Northumberland, Sussex and Wyclif by Richard Godfrey (c.1728-c.1795) also replicate the ovals (figures 61-64).⁷⁰⁰ The use of an oval framing device within an ornate rectangle mirrors the design of numerous printed portrait series including the illustrations to the 1568 edition of Vasari's *Lives* (Florence), Giovio's *Elogia* (Venice, 1575) and Beza's *Icones* (Geneva, 1580). The device helped to give a sense of uniformity to images that had been gathered from a variety of sources.

Remnants of a sky-blue coloured paint that can be seen beneath the gilded spandrels on some of the paintings in the set may be a clue to their original appearance. The paint can be seen with the naked eye on around half of the pictures.⁷⁰¹ It appears to be confined to the spandrels and can be seen most clearly where the gilding is flaking away at the edges of these areas (figures 65, 66 and 67). There is no visible evidence of the pigment beneath the gilding on the frames or ribbons so the colour is unlikely to relate to a preparatory layer for the gold leaf. Furthermore, no blue can be detected on any of the six later paintings, which suggests that it is connected to the original appearance of the set. Although the blue paint is only visible on around half the paintings, a pigment sample taken from the Sussex portrait indicates that on some of the portraits the blue pigment may have been completely concealed by the thick white chalk layer beneath the gilded spandrels. No blue paint can be seen with the naked eye on any areas of the Sussex panel but a paint sample taken from the bottom left spandrel confirmed the presence of blue paint beneath the white layer (figure 68).⁷⁰² The pigment can also be seen by photomicroscopy in the same area where there are losses in the gilding and preparatory layers (figure 69). However, the presence of the blue paint remains difficult

⁷⁰⁰ BM 1902, 1011.6664. The portraits by Richard Godfrey were published in Francis Grose, *The Antiquarian Repertory: a miscellaneous assemblage of topography, history, biography, customs, and manners. New ed., with additions*, 4 vols (London: Jeffery, 1807-09) but each is inscribed with an earlier date (Bacon: Grose, II, p. 306, dated 1 May 1786; Northumberland: Grose, III, p. 58 (with accompanying text, p. 115), dated 1 May 1786; Sussex: Grose, III, p. 174, dated 1 April 1788; Wyclif: Grose, IV, p. 644, dated 1 October 1781). Other portraits from elsewhere are reproduced in these volumes, not all in ovals, so the engravings of the Knole portraits have not been adapted to fit a standard format for publication.

⁷⁰¹ See Vol. 2, Appendix 11, pp. 236-88.

⁷⁰² Rae, 'Sampling of three portraits', pp. 7-8. Smalt mixed with lead white was used for the decoration in the Cartoon Gallery (Jongsma, 'Knole Cartoon Gallery', p. 11) and the pigment detected on the Sussex portrait also appears to be smalt.

to interpret. It is unlikely that the backgrounds of the paintings were originally blue because the traces of the pigment can only be seen in the areas of the spandrels. For the same reason, it is unlikely to relate to a priming layer unless a different colour was used beneath the paint in the areas of the spandrels. The blue is similar to the colour used on the cornice in the Cartoon Gallery so the portraits may have been decorated with blue details and gold frames as a continuation of this colour scheme.⁷⁰³

Elements of the frieze at Knole are similar to that at Weston. In both cases the evidence suggests that the portraits were punctuated by carved caryatids and atlantes. At Knole some of these carved figures are still in place along the frieze, flanking the flower and fruit paintings (figures 70 and 71). They are painted in blue and white with gilt details and are clearly part of the original scheme in the gallery. They are arranged below the cornice brackets where they are fixed in place by dowels in the labels.⁷⁰⁴ Holes or dowels can be seen in the labels that currently have no figure attached (figure 72) and fifteen more terms, apparently part of the same series, survive in storage at the house.⁷⁰⁵ It is likely, therefore, that each portrait was originally flanked by a term on both sides. It is probable that they were arranged in categories and broadly in chronological order, as they are likely to have been at Weston. Vertue noted in 1728 that the portraits ‘seem not to be put in regular order of time’ but by that point they had been moved into the Horn Gallery and are unlikely to have followed their earlier arrangement. However, it is notable that even then the foreign sitters were all listed together. Currently, the portraits are arranged in approximate chronological order, with the foreign sitters (minus William the Silent) in a group at the end. Sir George Scharf (1820-1895), the first director of the Gallery, was responsible for a re-display of the set in 1876 and it is probable that the current arrangement follows this hang.⁷⁰⁶

⁷⁰³ A similar blue colour can also be seen on a number of carved gilt frames in the Knole collection that have been dated by Jacob Simon to the 1610s or 1620s (Simon, ‘A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole’ (online)). Further pigment analysis on the portrait set and on these frames may help to determine if there is a connection.

⁷⁰⁴ Some of the terms currently in place are slightly misaligned which may suggest that they have been removed and put back in a different order.

⁷⁰⁵ Coleman, ‘Mysterious Blooms’, p. 81.

⁷⁰⁶ An entry in Scharf’s diary for 18 July 1876 reads: “At Knole... Prepared a chronological & classified series of arranging pictures in Brown Gallery.” The entry for the following day reads: “Arranging pictures in the Brown Gallery. Completed the hanging of the entire series by Belcamp in two rows.” (HAL, NPG7/3/1/33. I am grateful to Elizabeth Heath for this reference.)

Attribution

The question of how many painters were involved in the making of the Knole set is vexed not least because of the condition of the paintings, many of which have significant amounts of retouching. In addition, as the portraits have been copied from a variety of sources, including prints and paintings produced many decades apart, the aesthetic qualities of the paintings vary considerably. It is probable, however, that given the size of the commission several artists were responsible for the painting of the portraits. As a result of a suggestion made by Scharf, the set has previously been attributed to Jan Van Belcamp (*d.*1653), a Dutch artist known to have painted copies of sixteenth-century portraits for King Charles I.⁷⁰⁷ Because of this attribution, the set was considered for a number of years to have been painted in the 1630s or 1640s when Belcamp was active in England.⁷⁰⁸ The attribution, however, was rejected by Laing on the basis that the paintings are likely to be from an earlier date, and that they are not generally accomplished enough to have been by Belcamp.⁷⁰⁹ The evidence for the date of the set presented here further distances the paintings from this attribution.

It is likely that the portraits were produced (or at least sourced) by painters employed by Sackville to carry out decorative work elsewhere in the house. In March 1607/8 Sackville paid the London painter-stainer Paul Isaacson the significant sum of £100 towards the cost of painting the 'Gallery at Knole'.⁷¹⁰ The work on the Great Stair at Knole has also been attributed to Isaacson and he is also known to have carried out decorative work at Theobalds and Hatfield House.⁷¹¹ It is possible that the payment received by Isaacson covered the production of the portrait set as well as the decorative painting in the Gallery itself. If so, Isaacson probably delegated this work to members of his workshop or other painters working in London. The paintings were almost certainly produced in the capital where sources and materials could easily be obtained, before being transported to Knole for their installation. If Isaacson's commission did not include the set, other possible candidates connected to the work at the house include Martin van Bethlem and Henry Holdernes who were paid for 'painting and gilding the

⁷⁰⁷ Phillips, *History of the Sackville Family*, II, p. 423.

⁷⁰⁸ Coope, for example, follows this attribution in 'The "Long Gallery"', p. 62.

⁷⁰⁹ Laing, 'Knole: English, late 16th Century', p. 1.

⁷¹⁰ Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 190-91.

⁷¹¹ *Ibid*, p. 191.

patterne of a frame for a picture' in February 1607/8 and Ralph Treswell who sent for painters (possibly members of his workshop) who were working at Knole, to assist him with a commission at Penshurst Place in 1607.⁷¹² Alternatively, the commission may have been outsourced directly to a workshop in London, possibly one from which Sackville had previously ordered portraits.

A Reading of the Set

My argument for the date of the Knole set has so far relied heavily on technical information gathered from the surviving paintings, but the following analysis of the meaning and purpose of the set further links it to the first earl of Dorset. Thomas Sackville is likely to have commissioned a set of this type for a number of reasons. When he began work on Knole in 1605 he was one of England's leading courtiers. He had been Lord Treasurer since 1599 and Chancellor of the University of Oxford since 1591. As Edward Town has recently argued, Sackville was keen to display the trappings of high office and to present himself as a man worthy of the high status that he had achieved.⁷¹³ His acquisition of Knole and subsequent remodelling was no doubt driven in part by a desire to fashion himself as an ideal courtier, but he must also have been motivated by thoughts of his posthumous legacy.

Like most Jacobean courtiers, Sackville is known to have taken an interest in portraiture. As well as having his own portrait painted by de Critz in c.1601, he gave a green sandstone bust of Sir Thomas Bodley (1545-1613) to the newly founded Bodleian Library in 1605.⁷¹⁴ In addition, it might have been Sackville that acquired a set of pictures of the Twelve Emperors that was moved to Knole from Dorset House, the family's London residence, in 1624.⁷¹⁵ Sackville's interest in portraiture is likely to have been stimulated by his experiences on the continent. In the 1560s, 1570s and 1580s he travelled to Italy, France and the Low Countries, visiting the Vatican, the Château de Madrid and the Tuileries in France, and other grand residences, libraries and

⁷¹² Ibid, pp. 215, 192.

⁷¹³ Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 17, 86.

⁷¹⁴ Versions of the de Critz portrait survive at Knole and the NPG: NTIN 129728 and NPG 4024; Kenneth Garlick, *Catalogue of Portraits in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Bodleian, 2004), p. 31.

⁷¹⁵ Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', p. 94. Town has noted that in 1629 the emperors were described as being in frames so it is likely that they were either paintings or prints.

churches where he undoubtedly encountered displays of *uomini famosi*.⁷¹⁶ On a diplomatic mission to the Netherlands in 1587 his party was taken to the City Hall in Haarlem where they saw the late fifteenth-century painted series of the Counts and Countesses of Holland.⁷¹⁷ It is likely that he would also have been aware of continental collections through published accounts, engravings and effigy books such as Giovio's *Elogia*. As Town has noted, Sackville maintained contact with English men travelling on the continent including his own son, also called Thomas, who spent much time overseas, and Thomas Wilson (*d.*1629), a friend and correspondent, either of whom could have sent books, engravings and details of places they had visited.⁷¹⁸ A list made in *c.*1600 of the portraits included in the 'D. of Florences Gallery' (the Medici collection) survives in Wilson's correspondence preserved in the State Papers.⁷¹⁹ Sackville's antiquarian interests are also likely to have fuelled his interest in portraiture. Although he was not a member of the Society of Antiquaries, there is evidence to suggest he owned a large library of books and collected medieval manuscripts, which he allowed scholars to consult.⁷²⁰ A number of historical and antiquarian works were dedicated to him including Thomas Danett's *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the Eight* (1600) and Francis Godwin's *Catalogue of the bishops of England* (1601).⁷²¹

Sackville was nearly seventy when he acquired the lease of Knole in January 1603/4 and within five years he was dead.⁷²² It has been suggested that he conceived the Great Stair scheme, which includes personifications of the vices and virtues as well as

⁷¹⁶ On his visits overseas, see Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 29-48, 71-74.

⁷¹⁷ Details of this trip were recorded by one of Sackville's companions, Maurice Kyffin (*c.*1555-1598), a Welsh scholar who was a tutor to his son (E.D. Jones, 'Maurice Kyffin's Account of Lord Buckhurst's Embassy to the Netherlands, 1587', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 13: 1 (1963), 70-85 (p. 83)). For details of the paintings, which survive, see note 155 in this thesis.

⁷¹⁸ Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', p. 173.

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁷²⁰ McKisack, *Medieval History*, pp. 51, 59; Town, 'A House 'Re-edified'', pp. 91-93.

⁷²¹ STC 6234 and 11937. Rivkah Zim, "'Marvellously Given to Be Antiquaries": William Fleetwood's *Itinerarium* and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst' in *The Name of a Queen: William Fleetwood's Itinerarium Ad Windsor*, ed. by Charles Beem and Dennis Moore (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 105-23 (p. 113) and Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', p. 88.

⁷²² Sackville first acquired the lease to Knole, then owned by the Crown, in 1569 but gave it up in 1574, possibly for financial reasons. He reacquired it in 1604 and acquired the freehold the following year (Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 54-67).

the Four Ages of Man, as a form of *memento mori*.⁷²³ Iconographically, the scheme was reflective but, with its fashionable classical elements, use of continental prints and feigned marble, it was also a display of taste and status. Similarly, the portrait set had a decorative function and was therefore a tool in Sackville's self-fashioning, but it also provided a retrospective view of the political, cultural and religious context in which he had lived his life. It alluded to the fundamental changes brought about by the break with Rome and church reform, and threats to the security of the nation from Roman Catholic powers on the continent. It also alluded to domestic issues such as the downfall of the 4th Duke of Norfolk, which caused a regional power vacuum in Sussex from which Sackville personally benefitted.⁷²⁴ National heroes such as Francis Drake, John Norris and the Earl of Nottingham were included, all famous for having played a vital role in the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, as were leading courtiers and statesmen with whom Sackville himself had worked and associated, including Burghley, Salisbury, Leicester and Walsingham. The tactful inclusion of important contemporary figures such as Salisbury, Nottingham, Suffolk, Bancroft and Northampton, was probably partly intended to flatter potential visitors to the house.

The portraits of bishops represented the important changes in the church during Sackville's lifetime. As I have already noted, portraits of men such as Wolsey and Gardiner were widely displayed by both Protestant and Roman Catholic patrons throughout the sixteenth century; they were not intended to signify religious sympathies but to represent the fundamental changes brought about by the English Reformation. Most portrait collections included portraits of bishops (see Table 8) and there is evidence to suggest that small sets of portraits of bishops were produced in the late sixteenth century. For example, a set of paintings representing Gardiner, Wolsey, Reginald Pole (the last Roman Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury) and probably Edmund Bonner (*d.*1569), Bishop of London, that survives at Trinity College, Cambridge has recently been dated by technical analysis to between 1585 and 1596.⁷²⁵ In addition, the *Heroologia*, which was intended for a Protestant audience, included

⁷²³ Cooper, *The Jacobean Country House*, p. 36; Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 194-96.

⁷²⁴ Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', p. 49.

⁷²⁵ The analysis was carried out in 2009 by Christine Slottved Kimbriel at the Hamilton Kerr Institute, University of Cambridge. It was established that the four paintings were made as a set. The results were presented at a conference entitled *Tudor and Jacobean Painting: Production, Influences and Patronage*, held at the NPG and the Courtauld Institute of Art in December 2010.

numerous portrait engravings of bishops, including Wolsey, Cranmer and Whitgift, as well as others associated with the reform of the church.

The inclusion of Sackville's own portrait in the set commemorated and celebrated his personal role in the national narrative. As a diplomat and royal minister he had been involved in shaping domestic and foreign policy during the reigns of both Elizabeth and James. In 1588, he played his part in the defeat of the Armada by mustering troops on the south coast and in 1604 he was present at the Somerset House Conference during which a peace treaty with Spain was negotiated. Key figures from both events are represented in the set.⁷²⁶ Other figures with a particular personal significance were also included. For example, as a poet, the Earl of Surrey was a great influence on Sackville who had himself gained a reputation in his youth as an accomplished poet. In a verse written between 1566 and 1574, Sackville wrote of Surrey that he 'syttest hyest in the house off fame'.⁷²⁷ It was Surrey's youthful love poetry that had a particular impact on Sackville and it is perhaps for this reason that he is depicted as a youth holding a flower. Other portraits in the set commemorate Sackville's involvement with the University of Oxford. They include the portraits of Arundel, Leicester and Hatton, all of whom had preceded Sackville as Chancellor, and the portraits of Friar Bacon and Wyclif, both of whom were regarded as worthies of the institution. It is notable that portraits of Friar Bacon and Wyclif were also included in the Bodleian Library frieze. Thomas James, the librarian, had a particular interest in Wyclif; in 1608 he published an *Apologie for John Wickcliffe* and an edition of Wyclif's works under the title *Two short Treatises against... the Begging Friars*.⁷²⁸ It is possible that Sackville's interest in Wyclif had been stimulated by James's research.

Sackville had received an education influenced by humanism and he was interested in the idea of using history as a mirror to view contemporary issues, personal vices and moral exemplars.⁷²⁹ As a poet, his output reflected this interest. While at the Inner

⁷²⁶ Drake, Norris, Nottingham and Cumberland were all involved in the defeat of the Spanish Armada; Salisbury, Northampton and Nottingham were all present at the Somerset House Conference.

⁷²⁷ Rivkah Zim and M.B. Parkes, 'Sackvilles Olde Age: A Newly Discovered Poem by Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, Earl of Dorset (c.1536-1608)', *Review of English Studies*, n.s. 40: 157 (1989), 1-25 (p. 9).

⁷²⁸ STC 14445 and 25589.

⁷²⁹ On Sackville's education, see Town, 'A House 'Re-Edified'', pp. 14-15.

Temple in the late 1550s, he had co-written the blank-verse tragedy *Gorboduc* with Thomas Norton (1530/32-1584) and he had also contributed verses to the second part of the *A myrrour for magistrates*, published in 1563.⁷³⁰ *Gorboduc* drew on Senecan drama but took the central narrative from Geoffrey of Monmouth's chronicle history.⁷³¹ Written at a time when the question of the queen's marriage was of utmost importance, it was a warning of the dire consequences that could result from an uncertain succession. Both *Gorboduc* and the *Mirror* presented figures and situations from the nation's history that, it was hoped, would help their audiences to respond to contemporary issues. Sackville's portrait set, which included 'fallen' men such as the Duke of Norfolk, enemies of the state such as Parma and heroes such as Wilford and Drake, was probably intended to serve a similar purpose. The Knole set can therefore be closely tied to Sackville through personal connections and references that reflect his interests as well as the intellectual culture in which he lived his life.

Conclusions

By the 1590s painted and printed portraits of famous figures from history and the contemporary world were more frequently produced and therefore more visible than ever before in England. Consequently, they were more easily accessible to both artists and patrons for the purpose of copying. This meant that 'galleries of fame' such as those at Weston and Knole could be entirely made up of recognizable portraits of famous faces. The set at Weston contained images of stock figures from Tudor portrait collections although the paintings themselves were tailored specifically for the space and were derived from the most authoritative sources. These included paintings that had been produced almost a century earlier, namely the portraits of Henry V, Henry VI, Richard III and Prince Arthur, as well as very recent paintings, such as the portrait of the 2nd Earl of Essex after Segar. The set at Knole also included copies of recent paintings such as the portrait of the Earl of Salisbury as well as paintings after Holbein and other early Tudor designs. In comparison to the set at Weston, the Knole set included some figures that were less frequently represented in contemporary picture

⁷³⁰ Sackville's contribution to the *Myrrour* consisted of an allegorical verse entitled 'Induction' and 'The complaynt of Henrye duke of Buckingham'.

⁷³¹ Jessica Winston has attributed an interest in Seneca at the Inns of Court in the late 1550s and 1560s in part to the educational background and the intellectual culture of Sackville and his peers (Winston, 'Seneca in Early Elizabethan England').

collections including Friar Bacon and Wyclif. This reflects Sackville's higher status; as a courtier based near London and as Chancellor of the University of Oxford Sackville would have been able to access paintings in the royal palaces, the homes of other courtiers and the university colleges, as well as single-sheet engravings and printed books from which the more obscure portraits might have been sourced.

In his building of Weston and acquisition of a portrait set, Ralph Sheldon appears to have been motivated primarily by a desire to secure and perhaps raise his position in society. The figures included in his set were not personal heroes but rather a selection of illustrious national and international figures whose portraits were often to be found in collections across the country. Each of the figures had played a significant part in the recent history of the nation. In contrast, Sackville's more nuanced set did include some personal heroes and figures with whom he was personally associated. Although he was undoubtedly motivated by the need to create a residence that was fitting for his high office and would impress important visitors, Sackville was also concerned with his legacy and as such his set was more reflective and personally significant than the example at Weston.

Despite their differences, however, the Weston and Knole sets are comparable in many respects. Each was conceived as part of a wider decorative scheme that was informed by fashionable classical elements. In addition, both sets relied on the use of pre-existing sources and in both cases the paintings were almost certainly set into a frieze beneath the cornice of a large gallery. The paintings in these sets provide us with a cross-section of the portraits that made up late Tudor and early Jacobean painting collections in England. They were commissioned by men interested in the nation's history; they not only commemorated the figures represented, but recorded their likenesses and reminded the viewers of the part these figures had played in the national narrative. Sackville's biography and status meant that he was able to firmly position himself at the centre of that narrative and the inclusion of his own portrait in the set did just that. In contrast, Sheldon was not able to situate himself among kings and noblemen, but as an element of his 'goodly shew' the portrait set associated his family with the story of the nation. Moreover, through the interaction of the portraits with other decorative elements at the house, notably his tapestry maps, Sheldon was able to remind viewers of his family's historical importance in the region.

Conclusion

The evidence presented in this thesis shows that a significant market for easel portrait sets developed in the last quarter of the sixteenth century and was probably at its height between the years 1580 and 1620. A lack of surviving paintings coupled with an absence of documentary references indicates that sets of five or more painted portraits were generally not produced in England before the reign of Elizabeth I. Although there is clear evidence provided by the surviving set of benefactors at Peterhouse College, Cambridge that larger sets were being produced from at least the 1560s, the majority of extant Tudor sets date from around 1580 or later as do most identifiable documentary references to sets. The market for portrait sets of English kings and queens in particular appears to have increased considerably from around the 1580s when the ‘standard’ set commencing with Edward III was established. The demand for English royal sets probably peaked in the 1590s and early 1600s although there is some evidence that sets of this type continued to be produced into the reign of Charles I.⁷³² The same period also appears to have seen a marked increase in the number of civic institutions that were commissioning painted portrait sets, particularly among London’s livery companies.

It is argued in Chapter 1 that despite the apparent absence of extensive portrait sets from English painting collections in the first half of the century, the portrait collections accumulated by the Crown and other elite patrons in this period did much to inspire the later fashion. It is probable that there were some small sets in the royal collections under Henry VII and Henry VIII including the four portraits of the Valois dukes of Burgundy and probably also a set of family portraits, versions of which were sent up to the Scottish Court in 1502. Furthermore, it appears that the first known set of posthumous portraits of English kings was produced for the Crown, probably in the early years of Henry VIII’s reign. These early paintings of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III may not have generated an immediate demand for copies but they were to prove hugely

⁷³² A set of portraits depicting English monarchs from William I to Charles I based on the engravings in the *Baziliologia* survives at Westwood Manor, Wiltshire (NTINs 222816-222835) (see Aviva Burnstock, Christine Sitwell, Catherine Daunt and Sarah Freeman, ‘A Room Transposed: A Technical and Historical Study of the King’s Room, Westwood Manor, Wiltshire, UK’, *Studies in Conservation*, 57: s1 (2012), S43-S51). The set came to Westwood from nearby Keevil Manor in 1911. A set of kings and queens up to Charles I painted on panels in feigned ovals was formerly in the collection of the Hon. Victor Saumarez at Shrubland Park, Suffolk (photographed for the Courtauld survey in 1954).

influential at a later date, not only because they provided ‘authentic’ or at least authoritative portrait types for these sitters, but also because they set in place conventions in terms of size, format and composition that were to be adhered to by many of the makers of Elizabethan and Jacobean sets. Other early sixteenth-century portraits, including the paintings of Prince Arthur, Elizabeth of York and many of the court figures that sat for Holbein, were also to be used as prototypes for the paintings in later sets.

The information gleaned from the inventory of Kenninghall taken in c.1578 when viewed alongside the surviving group of arched-top portraits in the collection of the Society of Antiquaries, indicates that copies of portraits in the royal collections may have been produced for an elite few as early as the 1530s. Some of these copies may have been commissioned in small groups. The spread of canonical portrait types was facilitated by a culture of repetition and copying that began in England in the first half of the century. Copies widened the visibility of certain portrait types and made it possible for further copies to be produced by those who did not have access to the originals. By the early seventeenth century it was possible for a large and complicated set of recognizable portraits such as that made for Knole to be produced entirely from pre-existing sources.

The way that portraits were displayed in the first half of the century may also have contributed to the later taste for sets. The mid-century inventories of the royal collection and the inventories of other early collections including those at Baynard’s Castle and Lambeth Palace indicate that portraits were displayed in dynastic or thematic groups in these locations. ‘Sets’ made up of pictures that had entered the collections at different times consequently formed on the walls and this is likely to have inspired others to commission groups of related sitters *en bloc*. In addition, the practice of displaying portraits in galleries, which had been established by the English Crown by 1547, had become conventional by the end of the century. Inspired by the long galleries in the royal palaces, particularly those at Hampton Court, English courtiers built galleries of their own from the 1540s and particularly during the secular building boom that took place between 1570 and 1625. Due to the example first set by the monarch, portraits were viewed as an appropriate form of decoration for long galleries and sets were ideal for filling large areas of wall space. The paintings in a set were all approximately the

same size and made to the same format so they could be displayed in neat lines, satisfying the late-Elizabethan and Jacobean taste for symmetry and order.

New building was a direct stimulus for the acquisition of portrait sets. Many known sets were purchased or specially commissioned to decorate newly built or refurbished spaces including the sets at Weston and Knole, and probably the Dulwich sets. When the Merchant Taylors' Company made changes to its hall in 1602, it was decided that a set of portraits would provide appropriate decoration for the newly created King's Chamber. Bess of Hardwick's son purchased numerous paintings in 1599 and 1600 to fill the gallery of the new Hardwick Hall, some of which filled gaps in the family's pre-existing series of royal portraits. It is probable that other sets, including the paintings of kings and queens and 'coloured portraits' of emperors at Theobalds, were also acquired specifically to fill new spaces. Under Elizabeth and James, building was a sign of prosperity, and magnificent, lavishly decorated buildings were symbols of high status. Moreover, courtiers needed to be prepared for royal progresses and for other important visitors. Thomas Sackville's changes to Knole, including the decoration of the Cartoon Gallery, were no doubt motivated to a large degree by the fact that Sackville's position meant that he needed to be ready to receive the king and other important guests including visiting embassies. As we have seen, Burghley increased Theobalds for similar reasons.

New building may have spurred the acquisition of portrait sets but a number of other factors coincided to make sets an appropriate and desirable form of decoration in the late sixteenth century. Firstly, easel portraits had become more affordable and more accessible to a wider audience than they had been in the first half of the century. In comparison to tapestries, for example, panel portraits could be purchased relatively inexpensively and the paintings could be tailored to meet varying budgets. The paintings in the set made for Weston, for example, would have cost considerably more than the type of 'off the peg' paintings that were purchased by Edward Alleyn due to the unusual format of the bespoke panels, the superior quality of the painting and the use of gold leaf. By the end of the century, however, for those who were satisfied with paintings made to a standard format, portraits of kings and queens and other 'popular' sitters such as Thomas Wolsey and Stephen Gardiner could be purchased readymade from shops in London as the account books of Bess of Hardwick's son testify.

Secondly, portraits of historical and exemplary figures resonated with the intellectual culture of Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Ideas relating to humanism and the continental Renaissance were beginning to impact on the visual arts in England under Henry VII and Henry VIII, but it was not until the reign of Elizabeth I that these ideas began to have a wider influence. As is suggested in Chapter 1, it is possible that the Crown's acquisition of portraits of Henry V, Henry VI and Richard III in the first or second decade of the sixteenth century was motivated by humanist ideas about the exemplary portrait. It was felt, perhaps, that images of recent monarchs, especially those who had been embroiled in the civil conflict of the fifteenth century, could provide the king with moral guidance. In addition, the concept of the exemplary portrait may have influenced the way that easel paintings were displayed in the royal palaces. The dynastic and thematic groups on the walls of the galleries at Hampton Court and St James's Palace under Henry VIII and Edward VI may have been deliberately ordered to provide a *speculum principis*. Beyond the court, Bishop Sherborn's set of heroes and heroines at Amberley Castle reflected some knowledge of the cycles of *uomini famosi* that decorated Italian palaces from the late fourteenth century.

The continental Renaissance began to have a wider impact on English visual art from the 1560s, however, as a generation of men who had received an education influenced by humanism began to build, refurbish and decorate houses of their own. At the same time, the printing presses made humanist texts and continental prints more widely available, which spread both ideas and designs. Humanists advocated the display of exemplary figures such as ancient heroes and heroines, sibyls and prophets, rulers, poets and prelates. Significantly, the idea that the living could be edified by images of exemplary historical figures intersected with Protestant teachings advocated by prominent English voices including John Foxe. Some English patrons are likely to have been inspired by examples of *uomini famosi* that they had seen first-hand while travelling on the continent and others may have learned about this type of imagery through written accounts. Printed effigy books, including the illustrated editions of Giovio's *Elogia* and Vasari's *Lives* no doubt helped to bring the concept of the biographical portrait collection or series to England while also providing likenesses for some historical figures.

The printing presses not only facilitated the spread of ideas and designs from other countries but also contributed greatly to the widespread interest in history that permeated English culture in the reign of Elizabeth I. It is argued in Chapter 3 that the demand for portrait sets of historical figures was generated in part by the publication of works of history such as John Stow's *Survey of London*, which may have motivated London's civic institutions to commemorate and advertise their history through portraiture, and Holinshed's *Chronicles*. English portrait sets primarily depicted figures from history or contemporaries whose place in the history books was assured. Portrait sets communicated specific historical narratives, relating the histories of families, institutions, professions and regions as well as the history of the nation. The Elizabethan period was a time of significant religious, social and economic change and amid such insecurity people turned to history to proclaim their rights, solidify their position in society and advertise their loyalties.

In the 1580s, shortly after the publication of the first part of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, the Elizabeth Society of Antiquaries was founded. The antiquarian movement in England had been galvanized by the dissolution of the monasteries, which had brought to light historical texts and objects that had remained inaccessible for centuries, and by the research undertaken on behalf of the Crown to justify the break from Rome. The pioneering work of John Leland and Matthew Parker and the patronage of younger scholars by Parker and others, encouraged further historical research by professional historians and writers such as John Stow and William Camden, as well as the development of antiquarianism as a popular pursuit among the aristocracy and gentry. Elizabethan antiquarianism developed partly as a reaction to domestic events but it was also influenced by the work of continental humanists, many of whom had been engaged in researching, collecting and documenting the material culture of the ancient world. The activities of continental humanists resulted in the publication of works such as Guillaume Rouillé's *Prima parte del Prontuario de le Medgalie*, which contained portraits of historical figures taken from coins and medals.

As it has been shown in this thesis, many of those who acquired portrait sets under Elizabeth I and James VI and I were engaged in antiquarian research including Lumley, Burghley and Sackville. Like the commonplace books that many kept, portrait sets would have appealed to antiquaries because they functioned as an edited and abridged

version of a particular historical narrative and relied on the viewer to call to mind the details of that narrative in order for their messages to be fully understood. Moreover, they recorded likenesses, some of which had been carefully researched. The inscription on Sir Edward Hoby's portrait in the Queenborough set claimed that he had gathered together scattered and neglected things (*Sparsa & neglecta coegi*). It is probable that other portrait sets were viewed in a similar way. The paintings may have been newly made but the information contained within them about likeness, costume, character (as expressed through physiognomy, props and inscriptions or verses) and achievements was gathered from historical sources.

The connection between antiquarianism and portrait sets meant that as far as possible the images in sets were derived from 'authentic' sources. When the illustrative woodcuts in John Rastell's *Pastyme of People* (1529/20) and the paintings of kings and bishops made for Chichester Cathedral in around the 1530s are compared to the images in Elizabethan and Jacobean portrait sets, it is clear that the concept of the verisimilar, recognizable and 'true' portrait became more important throughout the period.⁷³³ The figures in the Rastell and Chichester series are identified by attributes and inscriptions but the faces are archetypal and generalized. By the time royal portrait sets were being produced in the late sixteenth century, however, the use of 'standard' types derived from pre-existing paintings, monuments or prints, meant that not only did each portrait appear to represent a specific individual, but that for the most part, the figures could be identified without referring to an inscription.

The concept of a cycle or series of portraits was not new to English art in the sixteenth century, although the use of easel paintings for this purpose was. There are numerous examples of series of kings and queens, benefactors and other worthies in a variety of media in medieval art. The messages that were conveyed by portrait sets therefore relied in part on a pre-existing visual language. Henry VII drew on this language when he installed his 'pictures' of kings at Richmond Palace, using the series to communicate messages of legitimacy, lineage, authority and divine right. Richard II had installed a sculptural series of kings at Westminster Hall in the 1380s for a similar purpose and during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, the owners of easel portrait sets would use

⁷³³ For the Rastell series, see Vol. 2, Appendix 6, i, pp. 144-48.

their paintings to promote themselves or an institution in the same way. Along with architecture, heraldry, genealogies, clothes and other luxury objects, portraits sets became a visual symbol of lineage and status. In addition, they were used to show loyalty and allegiances and to imply personal or ancestral connections with illustrious figures. Usually situated in publicly accessible rooms, English portrait sets were generally meant to be seen by high-status visitors and to provide a backdrop to important meetings and conversations. Although portrait sets generally depicted figures from the past they could be used to help secure a prosperous future. Sets that commemorated acts of patronage were intended to encourage future patronage and sets that illustrated the illustrious history of a family or institution did so in order to secure the future of that family or institution. In addition, portrait sets had a decorative function and the paintings served to divert and inform the viewer. It is probable that portrait sets instigated many a conversation as viewers recalled the life stories of the sitters and reflected on their vices and virtues, comparing past events to contemporary issues.

For the most part the artists that created these paintings remain unidentified. More than one person typically produced a set and paintings of this type were rarely signed. Moreover, few documents survive that record details of their production. The paintings in some sets, including the Hornby set now in the collection of the NPG, appear to have been gathered from a number of different sources, perhaps by an agent or picture seller, and it is likely that the many of the owners themselves did not know the names of the people who had produced their paintings. Even the owners of sets that were specifically commissioned, such as those made for Weston, Knole and the Merchant Taylors' hall, may only have dealt with the leader of a team of artists. It is likely that some of the people who produced these sets were primarily decorative painters, especially in cases where the portraits were integrated into a wider decorative scheme. Nevertheless, the majority of the portraits that have been closely examined for this thesis show that the methods used in their making do not differ significantly from the methods used by the makers of other types of portraits in this period. In general, however, the portraits in sets were painted more rapidly and are more linear in style than other contemporary types of portraiture. The majority of the portraits in sets derive from pre-existing sources and for this reason most were produced using patterns, as is evident from the underdrawing found on many of the surviving paintings. In some cases these patterns appear to have been traced but as paintings from the Dulwich set of kings and queens show, pouncing

was sometimes used to transfer the cartoon. Graphic sources were generally used for sitters for whom pre-existing paintings could not be located.

The evidence presented in this thesis indicates that English royal sets were the most frequently produced type of portrait set in this period. There were also, however, painted sets of ancient heroes and heroines; benefactors, founders and former members of institutions; sibyls; local heroes such as the Norman earls of Chester; church reformers; prelates; foreign notables including military leaders and rulers; lawyers and judges and Roman emperors. For subjects such as sibyls and Roman emperors, the number of sitters included in a set was determined by tradition, but for other subjects, such as English kings and queens, the size of the set and the specific sitters included varied depending on the wishes of the owner. Royal sets could, for example, include consorts and, like the Ripon set, many probably included portraits of figures such as Elizabeth Woodville, Jane Seymour and Margaret Beaufort in order to provide a full genealogy of the monarchy. In some cases, the choice of monarchs in portrait sets could be tailored to reflect the history of the owner. Lumley's set of English kings and queens began with Richard II for this reason. Sets that went back in time beyond Edward III were probably first produced in the late 1590s, inspired by the printed series devised by Thomas Talbot, Henry Holland and others. In the final years of the sixteenth century, the English repertoire of historical portraiture was extensive enough to make larger and more nuanced sets such as those at Weston and Knole possible.

It is clear from the evidence presented in this thesis that this genre of painting formed an important strand of Elizabethan and Jacobean art. During the reign of Elizabeth I portrait sets became symbols of learning, sophistication and status, largely due to the intellectual pursuits with which they were associated and their appropriation of a long-established visual language. The unattributed paintings that made up Tudor and Jacobean sets were not highly accomplished works of art but their value lay elsewhere. Their function was to decorate, to delight, to entertain, to teach and to communicate important messages about loyalty, lineage, legacy and power and for a short time English painting collections were, it seems, considered incomplete without a portrait set.

Bibliography

Airs, Malcolm, “‘Pomp or Glory’: The Influence of Theobalds”, in Pauline Croft, ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils, 1558-1612* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2002), pp. 2-19

Aleci, Linda Klinger, ‘Images of Identity: Italian Portrait Collections of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries’ in Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson, eds, *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance* (London: BM, 1998), pp. 67-79

Alexander, Jonathan and Paul Binski, eds, *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1987)

Ames, Joseph, *Typographical Antiquities* (London: Faden, 1749)

Anglo, Sydney, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (London: Seaby, 1992)

— *Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969)

Anon, *Gentleman’s Magazine*, 56: 1 (1786), 5-6

Anon, *Historical and Descriptive Catalogue of Pictures Belonging to his Grace the Duke of Leeds* (London: Darling, 1902)

Anon, *Hornby Castle: Catalogue of Pictures* (London: Spottiswoode, 1898)

Anon, ‘Hornby Castle, Yorkshire, The Seat of the Duke of Leeds’, *Country Life*, 20: 497 (1906), 54-64

Anzelewsky, Fedja, ‘An Unidentified Portrait of King Edward IV’, *Burlington Magazine*, 109: 777 (1967), 702-703+705

Archer, Ian. W., ‘The Arts and Acts of Memorialization of Early Modern London’ in J.F. Merritt, ed., *Imagining Early Modern London. Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype 1598-1720* (Cambridge: CUP, 2001), pp. 89-113

Arnold, Ralph, *Cobham Hall, Kent: Notes on the House, its Owners, the Gardens and Park and Objects of Special Interest* (Cobham [n. pub., 1967(?)])

Aubrey, John, *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, begun in the year 1673, by John Aubrey ... and continued to the present time*, 5 vols, (London: Curll, 1719)

Auerbach, Erna, *Tudor Artists: A Study of Painters in the Royal Service and of Portraiture on Illuminated Documents from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Elizabeth I* (London: Athlone Press, 1954)

Auerbach, Erna and C. Kingsley Adams, *Paintings and Sculpture at Hatfield House* (London: Constable, 1971)

Baker, Audrey, *English Panel Paintings, 1400-1558: A Survey of Figure Paintings on East Anglia Rood Screens*, ed., updated and extended by Ann Ballantyne and Pauline Plummer (London: Archetype, 2011)

Barber, Tabitha, 'The Arundells of Wardour: Roman Catholic patrons of art in late seventeenth-century England', *Apollo*, 143: 410 (1996), 12-17

Barker, Nicolas, ed. *The Great Book of Thomas Trevilian: A Facsimile of the Manuscript in the Wormsley Library* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2000)

Barlow, Frank, *William Rufus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983)

Barron, Kathryn, 'The Collecting and Patronage of John, Lord Lumley (c.1535-1609)' in Edward Chaney, ed., *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003), pp. 125-158

Bate, Jonathan and Dora Thornton, *Shakespeare: Staging the World* (London: BM, 2012)

Bath, Michael, *Renaissance Decorative Painting in Scotland* (Edinburgh: National Museums of Scotland, 2003)

Batho, G.R., *The Household Papers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland (1564-1632)* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1962)

— 'The Library of the Wizard Earl: Henry Percy, Ninth Duke of Northumberland (1564-1632)', *The Library*, 5th ser., 15: 1 (1960), 246-61

Baumach, Sybille, *Shakespeare and the Art of Physiognomy* (Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks, 2008)

Bentley-Cranch, Dana, 'An Early Sixteenth-Century French Architectural Source for the Palace of Falkland', *ROSC*, 2 (1985), 85-95

Biddle, Martin, 'The Stuccoes of Nonsuch', *Burlington Magazine*, 126: 976 (1984), 411-17

Binski, Paul, 'The Early Portrait: Verbal or Pictorial?' in Gerhard Schmidt, ed., *Europäische Kunst um 1300 XV Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte I* (Vienna: Bohlau, 1986), pp. 211-15

Blackett-Ord, Mark, 'Blackett, Sir William, first baronet (1621-1680)', *ODNB*, (Oxford: OUP, 2004) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/61542>> [accessed 5 January 2014]

Blomefield, Francis, *Collectanea Cantabrigiensa, Or Collections Relating to Cambridge* (Norwich: printed for the author, 1751)

Bolton, P.A. and Paula Watson, 'BLACKETT, Sir Edward, 2nd Bt. (1649-1718), of Newby, Yorks. in *HPO* <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/blackett-sir-edward-1649-1718>> [accessed 23 January 2014]

Bonomi, Patricia U., 'Hyde, Edward, third earl of Clarendon (1661–1723)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/41053>> [accessed 4 February 2014]

Bracken, Susan, 'Robert Cecil as Art Collector' in Pauline Croft, ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils, 1558-1612* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2002), pp. 121-137.

Bracken, Susan and Maurice Howard, 'Lumley Castle and its Inventories' in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 29-33

Braddy, Halden, 'Cambyuskan's Flying Horse and Charles VI's "Cerf Volant"', *Modern Language Review*, 33: 1 (1938), 41-44

Bridgman, John, *An Historical and Topographical Sketch of Knole in Kent; With a Brief Genealogy of the Sackville Family* (London: Lindsell, 1817)

Britnell, Jennifer, 'The Rise and Fall of the Sibyls in Renaissance France' in Alasdair A. MacDonald and Michael W. Twomey, eds, *Schooling and Society: The Ordering and Reordering of Knowledge in the Western Middle Ages* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), pp. 173-85

Britton, John and Edward Wedlake Brayley, *The Beauties of England and Wales, Or, Delineations, Topographical, Historical and Descriptive of Each County: Volume II* (London: Vernor, Hood & Shape etc., 1801)

Bullard, M.R.A., 'Talking Heads: The Bodleian Frieze, its Inspiration, Sources, Designer and Significance', *Bodleian Library Record*, 14 (1994), 461-500

Bülow, Gottfried von and Wilfred Powell, 'Diary of the Journal of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania, through England in the Year 1602', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s., 6 (1892), 1-67

Burke, Peter, 'Popular History' in Joad Raymond, ed., *The Oxford History of Popular Print Culture, Volume I: Cheap Print in Britain and Ireland to 1660* (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 443-452

Burnette, Arianne, 'Lockey, Rowland (c.1566–1616)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, September 2010) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16897>> [accessed 15 February 2014]

Burnstock, Aviva, Christine Sitwell, Catherine Daunt and Sarah Freeman, 'A Room Transposed: A Technical and Historical Study of the King's Room, Westwood Manor, Wiltshire, UK', *Studies in Conservation*, 57: s1 (2012), S43-S51

Campbell, Lorne, *The Early Flemish Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty The Queen* (Cambridge: CUP, 1985)

— *Renaissance Portraits: European Portrait-Painting in the 14th, 15th and 16th Centuries* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1990)

Carley, James P., 'Leland, John (c.1503–1552)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004; online edn, May 2006) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16416>> [accessed on 30 March 2013]

Cerasano, S.P., 'Edward Alleyn: 1566-1626' in Aileen Reid and Robert Maniura, eds, *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman* (London: DPG, 1994), pp. 11-31

Chappell, Emily, 'New light on the "Little Men" of Naworth Castle' in Richard Marks, ed., *Late Gothic England: Art and Display* (Donington: Shaun Tyas; London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 2007)

Chaney, Edward, 'The Italianate Evolution of English Collecting' in Edward Chaney, ed., *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003), pp. 1-124

Church, Dorian, 'The Cartoon Gallery, Knole' (unpublished MA dissertation, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 1998)

Clay, J.W., ed., *Dugdale's Visitation of Yorkshire, with additions*, 3 vols (Exeter: Pollard, 1899-1917), II (1907)

Cliffe, John Trevor, *The Yorkshire Gentry from the Reformation to the Civil War* (London: Athlone Press, 1969)

Clode, C.M. *Memorials of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist, in the City of London* (London: Harrison, 1875)

Clough, Cecil H., 'Art as Power in the Decoration of the Study of an Italian Renaissance Prince: The Case of Federico Da Montefeltro', *Artibus et Historiae*, 16: 31 (1995), 19-50

Coke, Karen, 'The Amberley Castle Panels and a Drawing by William Henry Brooke', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, 145 (2007), 137-52

Coleman, John, 'Mysterious Blooms', *Country Life*, 191: 6 (1997), 78-81

Collins, Arthur, *The Peerage of England*, 4th edn, 7 vols (London: Woodfall, 1768), IV

Colvin, Howard M., *A History of the King's Works: Vol. 4, 1485-1660* (London: HMSO, 1982)

Committee of Council on Education, Science and Art, *Catalogue of the first special exhibition of national portraits ending with the reign of James II on loan to the South Kensington Museum, April 1866*, revised edn (London, 1866)

Coope, Rosalys, 'The Gallery in England: Names and Meanings', *Architectural History*, 27 (1984), 446-55

— 'The "Long Gallery": Its Origins, Development, Use and Decoration', *Architectural History*, 29 (1986), 43-84

Cooper, Nicholas, *The Jacobean Country House: From the Archives of County Life* (London: Aurum, 2006)

Cooper, Tarnya, *Citizen Portrait: Portrait Painting and the Urban Elite of Tudor and Jacobean England and Wales* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2012)

— 'The Enchantment of the Familiar Face: Portraits as Domestic Objects in Elizabethan and Jacobean England' in Tara Hamling and Catherine Richardson, eds, *Everyday Objects: Medieval and Early Modern Material Culture and its Meanings* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010) pp. 157-177

— *Searching For Shakespeare* (London: NPG, 2006)

Cooper, Tarnya, ed., *Elizabeth I and Her People* (London: NPG, 2013)

Cowper, Marcus, *Henry V: Leadership, Strategy, Conflict* (Oxford: Osprey, 2010)

Crane, Mary Thomas, 'Early Tudor Humanism' in Michael Hattaway, ed., *A Companion to English Renaissance Literature and Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 13-26

Crawford, Anne, 'Howard, John, first duke of Norfolk (d.1485)', *ODNB* (Oxford: <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13921>> [accessed 2 April 2014])

Croft-Murray, Edward, *Decorative Painting in England, 1537-1837*, 2 vols (London: Country Life, 1962-70), I (1962)

— 'Lambert Barnard: An English Early Renaissance Painter', *Archaeological Journal*, 113 (1957), 108-25

Cuddy, Neil, 'Dynasty and Display: Politics and Painting in England, 1530-1630' in Karen Hearn, ed., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630* (London: Tate Gallery, 1995), pp. 11-20

Cust, Lionel with C.F. Bell, *Illustrated Catalogue of Early English Portraiture* (London: Chiswick Press for the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1909)

D.H., *Gentleman's Magazine*, 76: 1 (1806), p. 417

Dempsey, Charles, *The Early Renaissance and Vernacular Culture* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2012)

Dragstra, Henk, 'Between Customer and Court: *A Brief Abstract of the Genealogie and Race of All the Kynges of England* and its Lost Source', *The Library*, 7th ser., 9: 2 (2008), 127-157

Dreyer, John Louis Emil, *Tycho Brahe* (Cambridge: CUP, 2014)

Dunlop, Anne, *Painted Palaces: The Rise of Secular Art in Early Renaissance Italy* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009)

Dwyer, Eugene, 'André Thevet and Fulvio Orsini: The Beginnings of the Modern Tradition of Classical Portrait Iconography in France', *Art Bulletin*, 75: 3 (1993), 467-480

Earwaker, J.P., *East Cheshire: Past and Present, of A History of the Hundred of Macclesfield in the County Palatine of Chester from Original Records*, 2 vols (London: printed for the author, 1877)

Edwards, E.R. and John P. Ferris, 'O'Brien, Henry, Lord Ibrackan (c.1642-78), of Great Billing, Northants.', *HPO*, <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1660-1690/member/o8217brien-henry-1642-78>> [accessed 28 January 2014]

Eichberger, Dagmar and Lisa Beaven, 'Family Members and Political Allies: The Portrait Collection of Margaret of Austria', *Art Bulletin*, 77: 2 (1995), 225-248

Emery, Anthony, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, 1300-1500*, 3 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1996)

Emmison, F.G., *Tudor Secretary: Sir William Petre at Court and Home* (London: Longmans, 1961)

English Heritage, Albury Park, Surrey <<http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1000299>> [accessed 28 January 2014]

English Heritage, 'Culford Park' <<http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1001363>> [accessed 2 February 2014]

Evans, Mark. 'The Lumley Inventory Contents and Contexts' in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 13-18

Evans, Mark, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010)

Farrell, Jerome, 'Tree Rings Reveal Secrets of Royal Portraits', *Leathersellers' Review* (2011/12), 12-13

Foister, Susan, 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings' in Aileen Reid and Robert Maniura, eds, *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman* (London: DPG, 1994), pp. 33-61

— *Holbein and England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2005)

— 'Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-Century English Inventories', *Burlington Magazine*, 123: 938 (1981), 273-82

Fossi, Gloria, *The Uffizi: The Official Guide* (Florence: Giunti, 1999, updated 2009)

Foster, Joseph, ed., *The Visitation of Yorkshire Made in the Years, 1584/5, by Robert Glover, Somerset Herald; to which is added the subsequent visitation made in 1612; by Richard St. George, Norroy king of arms, with several additional pedigrees* (London [n. pub.], 1875)

Frith, Brian, *Twelve Portraits of Gloucester Benefactors* (Gloucester: City Museums and Art Gallery, 1972)

Gadd, Ian Anders, 'Early Modern Printed Histories of the London Livery Companies' in Ian Anders Gadd and Patrick Wallis, eds, *Guilds, Society and Economy in London 1450-1800* (London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2002), pp. 29-50

Gapper, Claire, John Newman and Annabel Ricketts, 'Hatfield: A House for a Lord Treasurer' in Pauline Croft, ed., *Patronage, Culture and Power* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2002), pp. 67-95

Garlick, Kenneth, *Catalogue of Portraits in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Bodleian, 2004)

Gent, Lucy, *Picture and Poetry, 1560-1620: Relations Between Literature and the Visual Arts in the English Renaissance* (Leamington Spa: Hall, 1981)

Gibson, Katharine, "'The Kingdom's Marble Chronicle': The Embellishment of the First and Second Buildings, 1600 to 1690" in Ann Saunders, ed., *The Royal Exchange* (London: Guardian Royal Exchange, 1991)

Gibson, Robin 'A Jacobean Gallery of the Kings and Queens of England', *Folio* (Spring, 1995), 9-16

— 'The National Portrait Gallery's Set of Kings and Queens at Montacute House', *National Trust Yearbook* (1975), 81-87

Girouard, Mark, *Elizabethan Architecture: Its Rise and Fall, 1540-1640* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2009)

— 'The halls of the Elizabethan and early Stuart Inns of Court' in Jayne Elisabeth Archer, Elizabeth Goldring and Sarah Knight, eds, *The Intellectual and Cultural World of the Early Modern Inns of Court*, paperback edn (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), pp. 138-156

Goldring, Elizabeth, 'An Important Early Picture Collection: The Earl of Pembroke's 1561/62 Inventory and the Provenance of Holbein's "Christina of Denmark"', *Burlington Magazine*, 144: 1188 (2002), 157-160

— 'Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I and the Earl of Leicester for Kenilworth Castle', *Burlington Magazine*, 147: 1231 (2005), 654-660

Granger, James, *A Biographical History of England: From Egbert the Great to the Revolution*, 5th edn, 6 vols (London: Baynes, 1824)

Gregg, Ryan E., 'Panorama, Power and History: Vasari and Stradano's City Views in the Palazzo Vecchio' (unpublished doctoral thesis, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, 2008)

Gregory, Sharon, *Vasari and the Renaissance Print* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

Griffiths, Anthony, *The Print in Stuart Britain, 1603-1689* (London: BM, 1998)

Grose, Richard, *The Antiquarian Repertory: a miscellaneous assemblage of topography, history, biography, customs, and manners. New ed., with additions*, 4 vols (London: Jeffery, 1807-09)

Groos, G.W., trans. and ed., *The Diary of Baron Waldstein: A Traveller in Elizabethan England* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1981)

Grosvenor, Bendor, ed., *Lost Faces: Identity and Discovery in Tudor Royal Portraiture* (London: Philip Mould, 2007)

Guilday, Peter, *The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent, 1558-1795, Vol. I: The English Colleges and Convents in the Catholic Low Countries, 1558-1795* (London: Longmans, 1914)

Gunn, Steven, 'The Court of Henry VII' in Steven Gunn and Antheun Janse, eds, *The Court as a Stage: England the Low Countries in the Later Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), pp. 132-144

Hallett, Cecil, *The Cathedral Church of Ripon: A Short History of the Church and a Description of its Fabric* (London: Bell, 1901)

Hallett, Kirsty, 'New Light on Royal Portraits', *The Friends of Ripon Cathedral Annual Report* (May 2003), 10-13

Hamling, Tara, *Decorating the "Godly" Household: Religious Art in Post-Reformation Britain* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2010)

Harris, John, *The History of Kent* (London: Midwinter, 1719)

Haskell, Francis, *History and its Images: Art and the Interpretation of the Past* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993)

Hay, Malcolm, *Westminster Hall and the Medieval Kings* (London: BM, 1995)

Hayward, Maria, ed., *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: the Palace and its Keeper*, 2 vols (London: Illuminata Publishers for the Society of Antiquaries, London, 2004)

Head, David M., 'Howard, Thomas, second duke of Norfolk (1443-1524)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn September 2012)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13939>> [accessed 2 April 2014]

Hearn, Karen, 'Merchant-Class Portraiture in Tudor London: 'Customer' Smith's Commission, 1579/80' in Olga Dmitrieva and Tessa Murdoch, eds, *Treasures of the Royal Courts: Tudor, Stuarts and Russian Tsars* (London: Victoria and Albert Museum, 2013), pp. 36-43

Hearn, Karen, ed., *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England, 1530-1630* (London: Tate Gallery, 1995)

Hepburn, Frederick, "'pintor Ynglés": The earliest evidence for portraiture at the court of Henry VII' in Tarnya Cooper, Aviva Burnstock, Maurice Howard and Edward Town, eds, *Painting in Britain, 1500-1630: Production, Influences and Patronage* (London: British Academy, forthcoming)

— *Portraits of the Later Plantagenets* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1986)

— 'The Portraiture of Arthur, Prince of Wales', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 148 (1995), 148-68

Hentzner, Paul, *Travels in England During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth and Fragmenta Regalia by R. Naunton*, (London: Cassell's National Library, 1889)

Hervey, Mary, 'The Lumley Inventory of 1609', in *The Sixth Volume of the Walpole Society* (Oxford: OUP, 1918), pp. 36-46

Hind, A.M., *Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: A Descriptive Catalogue*, 3 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1952-64)

Historical Portraits Image Library, *Portrait of King Richard III, The Sheldon Master* (London: Philip Mould Ltd)

<<http://www.historicalportraits.com/Gallery.asp?Page=Item&ItemID=1030&Desc=King-Richard-III-%7C-The-Sheldon-Master>> [accessed 4 February 2014]

Houston, Mary G., *Medieval Costume in England and France: The Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: Black, 1939)

Howard, Maurice, 'Art and the Reformation' in Tim Ayers, ed., *The History of British Art, 600-1600* (London: Tate, 2008), pp. 232-41

— *The Building of Elizabethan and Jacobean England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2008)

— *The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics, 1490-1550* (London: Philip, 1987)

— 'Self-Fashioning and the Classical Moment in Mid-Sixteenth-Century English Architecture' in Lucy Gent and Nigel Llewellyn, eds, *Renaissance Bodies: The Human Figure in English Culture, c.1540-1660* (London: Reaktion, 1990), pp. 198-217

Howard, Maurice and Edward Wilson, *The Wyne: A Tudor House Revealed* (London: National Trust, 2003)

Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan Press, 1997)

Hoyle, R.W. 'Darcy, Thomas, Baron Darcy of Darcy (b. in or before 1467, d. 1537)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn January 2008)
<<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7148>> [accessed 1 February 2014]

Husselby, Jill, 'Architecture at Burghley House: the patronage of William Cecil, 1553-1598', 3 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, 1996)

Hutchinson, F.E., *Medieval Glass at All Soul's College: a History and Description Based on the Notes of G.M. Rushforth* (London: Faber and Faber, 1949)

Ingamells, John, *Dulwich Picture Gallery: British* (London: Unicorn Press, 2008)

Jaffé, Michael, 'Rubens' Roman Emperors', *Burlington Magazine*, 113: 819 (1971), 297-98+300-01+303

Jardine, Lisa, *The Awful End of Prince William the Silent: The First Assassination of a Head of State with a Handgun* (London: Harper Collins, 2005)

Jones, E.D., 'Maurice Kyffin's Account of Lord Buckhurst's Embassy to the Netherlands, 1587', *National Library of Wales Journal*, 13: 1 (1963), 70-85

Jones, Malcolm, *The Print in Early Modern England: An Historical Oversight* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2010)

Jongsma, D.E.R., 'Knole Cartoon Gallery: Architectural Paint Research' (unpublished report for the National Trust, 1998)

Joost-Gaugier, Christiane L., 'The Early Beginnings of the Notion of "Uomini Famosi" and the "De Viris Illustribus" in Greco-Roman Literary Tradition', *Artibus et Historiae*, 3: 6 (1982), 97-115

Kelley, Donald R. and David H. Sacks, eds, *The Historical Imagination in Early Modern Britain: History, Rhetoric, and Fiction, 1500-1800* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997)

Kendrick, Thomas D., *British Antiquity* (New York: Barnes & Noble; London: Methuen, 1950, reprint edn, 1970)

Kingsford, C.L., ed., *The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911)

Kipling, Gordon, *Enter the King: Theatre, Liturgy, and Ritual in the Medieval Civic Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998)

— *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (The Hague: Leiden University Press, 1977)

Kirby, W.J. Torrance, *The Zurich Connection and Tudor Political Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2007)

Knafla, Louis A., 'Hoby, Sir Edward (1560–1617)', *ODNB* (Oxford: OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2008) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13410>> [accessed 20 July 2014]

Knapp, James A., *Illustrating the Past in Early Modern England: The Representation of History in Printed Books* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003)

Leathes, Richard, 'Farewell Admiral Blake: A long overdue welcome to Captain George Venour (Fenner)' (unpublished research, 2011)

Levey, Santina M., *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles* (London: National Trust, 1998)

Levey, Santina M. and Peter K. Thornton, *Of Household Stuff: The 1601 Inventories of Bess of Hardwick* (London: National Trust, 2001)

Levis, H.C., *Notes on the Early British Engraved Royal Portraits Issued in Various Series from 1521 to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (London: Chiswick Press, 1917)

Levy, F.J., *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 1967; reprint edn, Toronto, Buffalo and London: University of Toronto Press, 2004)

Lewis, W.S., ed., *Horace Walpole's Correspondence*, 48 vols, (New Haven: YUP, 1937-83), XXI (1944)

Llewellyn, Nigel, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

Llewellyn, Nigel and Claire Gapper, 'The Funeral Monuments' in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 35-38

Luborsky, Ruth Samson and Elizabeth Morley Ingram, *A Guide to English Illustrated Books, 1536-1603*, 2 vols (Tempe, Ariz.: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998)

Lucas, Scott, 'A Mirror for Magistrates: Historical Tragedy and Contemporary Politics' in Mike Pincombe and Cathy Shrank, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Literature, 1485-1603* (Oxford: OUP, 2009), pp. 362-371

Lyons, John D., *Exemplum: The Rhetoric of Example in Early Modern France and Italy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989)

Lysons, Daniel, *The Environs of London*, 4 vols (London: T. Cadell, 1792-96), I (1792)

MacLeod, Catharine, Tarnya Cooper and Margaret Zoller, 'Appendix Three: A List of Portraits in the Lumley Inventory', in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 157-164

— 'The Portraits', in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 59-70

Marks, Richard, *Stained Glass in England During the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993)

Markham, Sarah, *John Loveday of Caversham, 1711-1789: The Life and Tours of an Eighteenth-Century Onlooker* (Salisbury: Russell, 1984)

Marsden, Jonathan, 'The Chastleton Inventory of 1633', *Furniture History*, 36 (2000), 23-42

Martindale, Andrew, *Heroes, Ancestors, Relatives and the Birth of the Portrait* (Maarssen: Gary Schwartz/ SDU, 1988)

Mason, Emma, *King Rufus: The Life and Murder of William II of England* (Stroud: History Press, 2008)

McCarthy, Sarah, Bernard Nurse and David Gaimster, eds, *Making History: Antiquaries in Britain, 1707-2007* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2007)

McCutcheon, Elizabeth, *Sir Nicholas Bacon's Great House Sententiae* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1977)

McKisack, May, *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971)

Metcalf, John Henry, *A Great Historic Peerage: The Earldom of Wiltes* (London: Chiswick Press, 1899)

Mercer, Eric, *English Art, 1553-1625* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962)

Millar, Oliver, *Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, (London: Phaidon Press, 1963)

Mommsen, Theodor E., 'Petrarch and the Decoration of the Sala Vivorum Illustrium in Padua', *Art Bulletin*, 34:2 (1952), 95-116

Moody, Charles Harry, *Handbook to Ripon Cathedral* (Ripon: Harker, 1919)

More, Thomas, *Utopia*, trans. and ed. by Dominic Baker-Smith (London: Penguin Classics, 2012)

Murrell, Jim, 'John Guillim's Book: A Heraldic Painter's *Vade Mecum*', *Walpole Society*, 57 (1995), 1-52

National Portrait Gallery, *Making Art in Tudor Britain* database
<<http://www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/making-art-in-tudor-britain/matbsearch.php>> and unpublished material, forthcoming [accessed 2011-2014]

National Trust, *Blickling Hall, Norfolk* (London: National Trust, 1987)

Neale, John Preston and Thomas Moule, *Views of the Seats of Noblemen and Gentlemen in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland*, 5 vols, 2nd ser. (London: Sherwood, Gilbert and Piper, 1824-29), III (1826)

Nicholas, John G., *The Unton Inventories relating to Wadley and Faringdon Co Berks in the Years 1596 and 1620* (London: Berkshire Ashmolean Society, 1841)

Nichols, John G., ed., *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London, 1550-1563* (London: Camden Society, 1848)

N.M.S., 'ROBINSON, William II (1534-1616), of York.' in *HPO*
<<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/robinson-william-ii-1534-1616>> [accessed 23 January 2014]

Ormerod, George, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester*, 3 vols (London: Lackington etc., 1819)

Payne, Ann, 'Heraldry and Genealogies' in Mark Evans, ed., *The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree: Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age* (London: Roxburghe Club, 2010), pp. 21-27

Perkinson, Stephen, *The Likeness of the King: A Prehistory of Portraiture in Late Medieval France* (London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009)

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *Yorkshire, the North Riding*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966)

Phillips, Charles J., *History of the Sackville Family (Earls and Dukes of Dorset). Together with a description of Knole, early owners of Knole, and a catalogue raisonné of the pictures and drawings at Knole*, 2 vols (London: Cassell, 1929)

Piggott, Jan, *Dulwich College: A History, 1616-2008* (London: Dulwich College, 2008)

Piper, David, 'The 1590 Lumley Inventory: Hilliard, Segar and the Earl of Essex - II', *Burlington Magazine*, 99: 654 (1957), 298-301+303

Pitts, Vincent J., *The Man Who Sacked Rome: Charles de Bourbon, Constable of France, 1490-1527* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994)

Pollard, A.W., G.R. Redgrave and others, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (London: Bibliographical Society, 1976-1991)

Preston, Arthur E., *Christ's Hospital Abingdon: The Almshouses, the Hall and the Portraits*, 2nd edn (Oxford: OUP, 1930)

Rae, Caroline, 'Sampling of three portraits from Knole House' (unpublished paint sampling report, 2013)

Rawlinson, Kent, 'The terracotta roundels or 'antique heads' or Giovanni da Maiano for the English court (c.1520-32)', *Antiquaries Journal*, 94 (forthcoming, 2014)

Roach, J.P.C., ed., *Victoria History of the Counties of England: A History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely: Volume 3: The City and University of Cambridge* (Oxford: OUP, 1959)

Robertson, W.A. Scott, 'Furniture and Pictures at Cobham Hall in 1672', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 17 (1887), 392-408

Robinson, Hastings, ed., *Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Volume 1* (Cambridge: CUP, 1846-7)

Robinson, John Martin, *The Dukes of Norfolk* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1995)

Rye, William Brenchley, *England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First* (London: Smith, 1865)

Sackville-West, Lionel, *Knole House: Its State Rooms, Pictures and Antiquities* (Sevenoaks: Salmon, 1906)

Sandys, William, 'Copy of the Inventory of Archbishop Parker's Goods at the time of his Death; communicated by William Sandys, Esq. F.S.A., in a Letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S. Secretary', *Archaeologia*, 30 (1844), 1-30

Saunders, Ann, ed., *The Royal Exchange* (London: Guardian Royal Exchange, 1991)

Scharf, George, 'Further Observations on the Portraits of Arthur Prince of Wales, by George Scharf, Esq., F.S.A.: in a letter to John Bruce, Esq., F.S.A.', *Archaeologia*, 39 (1870), 457-63

Scott, Harold Spencer, ed., *The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, For the Years 1593-1616: Together with Notes in Another Hand, For the Years, 1642-1649* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1902)

Scott, Jennifer, 'Painting From Life? Comments on the Date and Function of the Early Portraits of *Elizabeth Woodville* and *Elizabeth of York* in the Royal Collection' in Hannes Kleineke and Christian Steer, eds, *The Yorkist Age: Proceedings of the 2011 Harlaxton Symposium - Harlaxton Medieval Studies*, n.s., 23 (2013), 18-26

— *The Royal Portrait: Image and Impact* (London: Royal Collection, 2010)

Sears, Jayne and Francis R. Johnson, eds, *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* (London: BM, 1956)

Sharpe, Kevin, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2009)

Shaw, Henry, *Details of Elizabethan Architecture* (London: Pickering, 1839)

Shirley, Evelyn Philip, 'An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G., Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614, together with a transcript of his Will; prefaced by a Letter to Charles Spencer Perceval, Esq., LL.D., Director', *Archaeologia*, 42: 2 (1870), 347-78

Shoberl, Frederic, *The Beauties of England and Wales: Volume 14: Suffolk, Surrey, Sussex* (London: Harris, 1813)

Simon, Jacob, 'British Picture Restorers, 1630-1950'

<www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/directory-of-british-picture-restorers/british-picture-restorers-1630-1950-p> [accessed 31 March 2014]

— 'A Guide to Picture Frames at Knole, Kent', 1998, revised 2013

<www.npg.org.uk/research/programmes/the-art-of-the-picture-frame/guides-knole> [accessed 31 March 2014]

Smith, Nicola, 'The Ludgate Statues', *The Sculpture Journal*, 3 (1999), 14-25

— *The Royal Image and the English People* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001)

Society of Antiquaries of London, *Portraying the Past: Paintings from the Society of Antiquaries of London* (unpublished exhibition leaflet, July 2014)

Starkey, David, ed., *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: Society of Antiquaries MS 129 and British Library MS Harley 1419. Volume I: The Transcript* (London: Harvey Miller for the Society of Antiquaries, 1998)

Starkey, David and Susan Doran, eds, *Henry VIII: Man and Monarch* (London: BL, 2009)

Starn, Randolph, 'Reinventing Heroes in Renaissance Italy', *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 17: 1 (1986), 67-84

Stephens, Robert, ed., *Letters of Sr Francis Bacon* (London: Tooke, 1702)

Steinberg, S.H., 'A Portrait of George, Duke of Clarence', *Burlington Magazine*, 74: 430 (1939), 35-36

Stoke Prior Brushworks, *1966 Autumn Arts Festival, October 8th-16th: Stoke Prior Brushworks, Bromsgrove Worcs.* (Birmingham: printed by Sidney Smith, 1966)

Stone, Lawrence, 'The Building of Hatfield House, 1607-1612', *Archaeological Journal*, 112 (1965), 100-28

— *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965)

— *Sculpture in Britain: The Middle Ages* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955)

Strauss, Walter, *Hendrick Goltzius 1558-1617: The Complete Engravings and Woodcuts* (New York: Abaris Books, 1977)

String, Tatiana, *Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008)

Strong, Roy, *The English Icon: Elizabethan and Jacobean Portraiture* (London: Paul Mellon Foundation for British Art/ Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: Pantheon Books, 1969)

— *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (London: Pimlico, 2000)

— *Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963)

— *Tudor and Jacobean Portraits*, 2 vols (London: HMSO, 1969)

Summerson, John, *Architecture in Britain, 1530-1830*, 9th edn (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993)

— 'The Building of Theobalds, 1564-1584', *Archaeologia*, 97 (1959), 107-26

Syson, Luke, 'Introduction' in Nicholas Mann and Luke Syson, eds, *The Image of the Individual: Portraits in the Renaissance* (London: BM, 1998), pp. 9-14

Tager, Sharon, 'A Study of the Function and Production of the 'Sibyls and Prophets' Frieze in Chastleton House, Oxfordshire' (unpublished dissertation for the Diploma in the Conservation of Easel Paintings, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London, 2000)

Thevet, André, *Portraits from the French Renaissance and the Wars of Religion*, trans. by Edward Benson, ed. and introduced by Roger Schlesinger (Kirkville, Missouri: Truman State University Press, 2010)

Thorpe, S.M. and Alan Davidson, 'SHELDON, Ralph (c.1537-1613) of Beoley, Worcs.', *HPO* <<http://www.historyofparliamentonline.org/volume/1558-1603/member/sheldon-ralph-1537-1613>> [accessed 8 February 2014]

Thornton, Tim, *Cheshire and the Tudor State, 1480-1560* (Rochester, NY: Royal Historical Society, 2001)

Thurley, Simon, *Hampton Court: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003)

— *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England: Architecture and Court Life, 1460-1547* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1993)

Tittler, Robert, *The Face of the City: Civic Portraiture and Civic Identity in Early Modern England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007)

— *Portraits, Painters, and Publics in Provincial England, 1540-1640*, (Oxford: OUP, 2012)

Town, Edward, 'A House 'Re-Edified' – Thomas Sackville and the Transformation of Knole, 1605-1608' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sussex, 2010)

— "'Whilst he had his perfect sight'" – new information on John de Critz the Elder', *Burlington Magazine*, 165: 1312 (2012), 482-86

Toynbee, Paget, 'Walpole's Journals of Visits to Country Seats', *The Sixteenth Volume of the Walpole Society*, (Oxford: OUP, 1928), pp. 10-80

Trapp, J. B. and Hubertus Schulte Herbrüggen, *'The King's Good Servant': Sir Thomas More* (London: NPG, 1977)

Tudor-Craig, Pamela, 'Group Portraits of the Protestant Reformers' in Tara Hamling and Richard L. Williams, eds, *Art Re-formed: Re-assessing the Impact of the Reformation on the Visual Arts* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2007), pp. 87-102

— *Richard III* (London: NPG, 1973)

Turner, Hilary L., 'Biography and Epitaph of Ralph Sheldon, c.1537, d.1613', <<http://www.tapestriescalledsheldon.info/pdfs/NEWPP33BIOGWmS.pdf>> [accessed 29 August 2012]

— 'Glimpses of a gallery: the maps and 'paynted pictures' of Robert Hare', *Bodleian Library Record*, forthcoming

— 'Walter Jones of Witney, Worcester, and Chastleton: Rewriting the Past', *Oxoniensia*, 73 (2008), 33-44

Tyers, Ian, 'Tree-Ring Analysis of 10 Panel Paintings from Eton College, June 2009' (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., 2009)

— 'The Tree-Ring Analysis of 13 Panel Paintings from the Historical Portrait Set in the Brown Gallery, Sackville Collection, Knole', Report 566 (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., October 2012)

— ‘The Tree-Ring Analysis of 22 of the 44 Panel Paintings in the Historical Portrait Set in the Brown Gallery, Sackville Collection, Knole’, Report 580 (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., March 2013)

— ‘The Tree-Ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the National Portrait Gallery: Group 4.5’ (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., 2011)

— ‘Tree-Ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the Royal Collection’ (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., October 2010)

— ‘Tree-Ring Analysis of Panel Paintings from the Royal Collection’ (unpublished report, Dendrochronology Consultancy Ltd., January 2013)

— ‘Tree-Ring Analysis of a Series of Panel Paintings from Peterhouse College, Cambridge’ (unpublished report, University of Sheffield, 2003)

University of York, ‘The art world in Britain 1660 to 1735’, online database
<<http://artworld.york.ac.uk>> [accessed 2014]

Utrecht University, *Medieval Memoria Online* database
<<http://memodatabase.hum.uu.nl/memo-is/detail/index?detailId=748&detailType=MemorialObject>> [accessed 1 August 2014]

Vertue, George, *Vertue Note Books*, 7 vols, Walpole Society, XVIII, XX, XXII, XXIV, XXVI, XXIX, XXX (Oxford: OUP, 1929-50)

Vine, Angus, *In Defiance of Time: Antiquarian Writing in Early Modern England* (Oxford: OUP, 2010)

Walpole, Horace, *Anecdotes of Painting: With Some Account of the Principal Artists and Incidental Notes on Other Arts; collected by the late Mr. George Vertue, Volume 1*, 3rd edn (London: Dodsley, 1782)

Wark, K.R., *Elizabethan Recusancy in Cheshire* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1971)

Waterhouse, Ellis, *Painting in Britain, 1530 to 1790*, 5th edn (New Haven and London: YUP, 1994)

Watson, John, *Memoirs of the Ancient Earls of Warren and Surrey and Their Descendants to the Present Time*, 2 vols (Warrington [n. pub.], 1782)

Watt, Tessa, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991)

Wayment, Hilary G., ‘The Medieval Stained Glass’ in Sarah Brown, ed., *A History of the Stained Glass of St. George's Chapel, Windsor* (Windsor: Dean and Canons of Windsor, 2005)

Wells-Cole, Anthony, *Art and Decoration in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Influence of Continental Prints, 1558-1625* (New Haven and London: YUP, 1997)

White, Gillian, “‘that whyche ys nedefoulle and nesenary’: The Nature and Purpose of the Original Furnishings and Decoration of Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire’, 2 vols (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of the Renaissance, 2005)

White, Gillian, ed., ‘Appendix 4: Richmond Palace’ in Elizabeth Goldring, Faith Eales, Elizabeth Clarke and Jayne Elisabeth Archer, *John Nichols’s The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth I*, 5 vols, (Oxford: OUP, 2014), V, pp. 96-118

Williams, Neville, *A Tudor Tragedy: Thomas Howard, Duke of Norfolk* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1964)

Williams, Richard L., ‘Collecting and Religion in Late Sixteenth-Century England’ in Edward Chaney, ed., *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods* (New Haven and London: YUP, 2003), pp. 159-200

Willis, H.N., *Biographical Sketches of Eminent Persons whose portraits form part of the Duke of Dorset’s collection at Knole, with a brief description of the place* (London: Stockdale, 1795)

Winkler, Mary G., ‘A Divided Heart: Idolatry and the Portraiture of Hans Asper’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 18: 2 (1987), 213-30

Winston, Jessica, ‘Seneca in Early Elizabethan England’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, 59: 1 (2006), 29-58

Woldbye, Vibeke, ‘Flemish Tapestry Weavers in the Service of Nordic Kings’ in Guy Delmarcel, ed., *Flemish Tapestry Weavers Abroad: Emigration and the Founding of Manufactories in Europe* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), pp. 91-112

Wolfe, Heather, ‘A third manuscript by Thomas Trevelyon/Trevilian’ (7 December 2012) <http://collation.folger.edu/2012/12/a-third-manuscript-by-thomas-trevelyontrevelian/> [accessed 1 September 2014]

Wolfe, Heather, ed., *The Trevelyon Miscellany of 1608: A Facsimile of Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.b.232* (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 2007)

Woolf, Daniel R., ‘From Hystories to the Historical: Five Transitions in Thinking about the Past, 1500-1700’ in Paulina Kewes, ed., *The Uses of History in Early Modern England* (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2006), pp. 31-67

— *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

— *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture 1500-1730* (Oxford: OUP, 2003)

Woolfson, Jonathan and Deborah Lush, 'Lambert Barnard in Chichester Cathedral: Ecclesiastical Politics and the Tudor Royal Image', *Antiquaries Journal*, 87 (2007), 259-80

Wormald, Francis and C.E. Wright, eds, *The English Library before 1700* (London: Althone Press, 1958)

Worsley, Giles, 'Hornby Castle, Yorkshire', *Country Life*, 183:26 (1989), 188-93

Wright, C.E., 'The Dispersal of the Libraries in the Sixteenth Century' in Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright, eds, *The English Library Before 1700* (London: Althone Press, 1958), pp. 148-175

— 'The Elizabethan Society of Antiquaries and the Formation of the Cotton Library' in Francis Wormald and C.E. Wright, eds, *The English Library Before 1700* (London: Althone Press, 1958), pp. 176-212

Wright, J., ed., *The Letters of Horace Walpole*, 6 vols (London: Bentley, 1840)

Wright, Louis B., 'The Elizabethan Middle-Class Taste for History', *The Journal of Modern History*, 3: 2 (1931), 175-197

Yorke, Peter David, 'Bridgeman, John (*bap.* 1577, *d.* 1652)', *ODNB* (OUP, 2004, online edn, January 2010) <<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/3391>> [accessed 30 June 2014]

Young, Sidney, *Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London* (London: Blades, East & Blades, 1890)

Zim, Rivkah, "'Marveilously Given to Be Antiquaries": William Fleetwood's *Itinerarium* and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst' in Charles Beem and Dennis More, eds, *The Name of a Queen: William Fleetwood's Itinerarium Ad Windsor* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), pp. 105-23

Zim, Rivkah and M.B. Parkes, 'Sacyyles Olde Age: A Newly Discovered Poem by Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, Earl of Dorset (c.1536-1608)', *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 40: 157 (1989), 1-25

Works Published Before 1700

Baldwin, William and others, *A myrroure for magistrates* (London: Thomas Marshe, 1559) (STC 1247)

Camden, William, *Britain, of a chorographicall description of the most flourishing kingdomes, England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the ilands adjoyning, out of the depth of antiquitie*, trans. by Philemon Holland (London: impensis George Bishop and John Norton, 1610) (STC 4509)

Danett, Thomas, *A continuation of the historie of France from the death of Charles the Eight* (London: Thomas Charde, 1600)

England and Wales, Sovereign, *A proclamation against breakinge or defacing of monumentes of antiquitie, beyng set up in churches or other publique places for memory and not for superstition* (London, 1560) (STC 7913)

Foxe, John, *Actes and monuments of matters most speciall and memorable, happenyng in the Church, with a universall history of the same* (London: printed by John Day, 1583) (STC 11225)

Fuller, Thomas, *The church-history of Britain: from the birth of Jesus Christ, untill the year M.DC.XLVIII* (London: John Williams, 1655)

Giovio, Paolo, *Elogia veris clarorum vivorum imaginibus apposita, quae in Musaeo Joviano Comi spectantur* (Venice: Tramezzino, 1546)

— *Elogia virorum bellica virtute illustrium* (Basel: Petri Pernae, 1575)

Hill, Thomas, *The contemplation of mankinde contayning a singuler discourse after the art of phisiognomie* (London: William Seres, 1571) (STC 17787)

Holinshed, Raphael and others, *The firste [laste] volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande*, 2 vols (London: John Hunne, 1577) (STC 13568b)

Johnson, Thomas, *Iter plantarum investigationis ergo susceptum a decum sociis, in agrum cantianum anno. Dom. 1629 Julii. 13* (London(?): A. Mathewes, 1629) (STC 14703)

Lomazzo, Giovanni Paolo, *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge carvinge and buildinge*, trans. and ed. by Richard Haydocke (Oxford: Richard Haydocke, 1598) (STC 16698)

Monings, Edward, *The Landgrave of Hessen his princelie receiving of her Majesties ambassador* (London: printed by Robert Robinson, 1596) (STC 18013)

Moryson, Fynes, *An itinerary written by Fynes Moryson Gent. First in the Latine tongue, and then translated by him into English*, 3 vols (London: John Beale, 1617) (STC 18205)

Nash, Thomas, *Have with you to Saffron-Walden* (London: John Danter, 1596) (STC 18369)

Le Petit, Jean François, *A generall historie of the Netherlands*, trans. by Edward Grimeston (London: printed by A. Islip and G. Eld, 1608) (STC 12374)

Raleigh, Sir Walter, *The history of the world* (London: Walter Burre, 1614) (STC 20637)

Stow, John, *The chronicles of England from Brute unto this present yeare of Christ 1580* (London: Ralph Newbery, 1580) (STC 23333)

— *The annales of England* (London: Ralph Newbery, 1592) (STC 23334)

— *Annales ... continued and augmented by Edward Howes* (London: R. Meighen, 1632) (STC 23340)

Surrey, Henry Howard, Earl of and others, *Songes and sonnettes* (London: apud Richard Tottel, 31 July 1557) (STC 13861)

Manuscript Sources

Arundel Castle, West Sussex

Bibliotheca Norfolciana, fols 183ff, *Inrolment of Deeds &c and Inventory of Plate, Pictures, Wardrobe, &c* (1578)

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City

MS Reg lat. 666, *The diary of Zdeněk Brtnický z Valdštejna (Baron Waldstein)*

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford

MS Tanner 98, fols. 80-81, *Inventory of items in Sir John Hobart's gallery, the Spital, London (formerly belonging to Robert Hare)* (c.1609-13)

British Library, London

Additional MS 48343, *The Lyte Pedigree* (c.1605)

Additional MS 59741, Thomas Lyte, *Britaine's Monarchie* (1605)

Arundel MS 38, Thomas Hoccleve, *The Regiment of Princes* (1411-32)

Cotton MS Faustina C IX, *Genealogical and historical collections of Thomas Talbot* (second half of the 16th century)

Hargrave MS 274, *Nova Statuta Angliae* (1488-89)

Harley MS 70, fol. 80^v, *An Inventory of Stow Hall, Suffolk* (1620s)

Lansdowne MS 218, T.T., *A Booke, containing the true portraiture of the countenances and attires of the Kings of England* (London: John de Beauchesne, 1597), with notes in the hand of William Lambarde (1536-1601)

Royal MS 18 C XVII, *The armor of nobility* (1589-93)

Brotherton Library, University of Leeds

Ripon Cathedral MS 44, *Heneage Dering, Diary and Account Book* (1712-50)

Ripon Cathedral MS 58, *John Tuting, Miscellaneous Notes and Cuttings on the History of Ripon* (c.1824-65)

Cambridge University Library

Munby.c.10, Auctioneer's copy of *A Catalogue of all the Elegant and Rich Household Furniture, the Capital Library of well-chosen Books, Linen, China, Pictures, Prints and Drawings [...] of the Late William Sheldon, Esq; dec. At his Seat, called Weston, near Long Compton, in the County of Warwick*, (London: Christie & Ansell, 1781)

Chatsworth House, Derbyshire

Devonshire MSS, Chatsworth, Hardwick MS 10a, *Account book, 1597-1601, verified by William Cavendish*

College of Arms, London

1st M.13, *The Marriage of Prince Arthur* (1501)

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Parker MS 213, Jean Galopes, *Le Livre Doré de la Vie de Nostre Seigneur Jesu Crist* (early 15th century)

Dulwich College Archives, London

Henslowe-Alleyn papers, MS 9, *Diary and Account Book of Edward Alleyn*, (September 29, 1617-October 1, 1622)

Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington DC

V.b.232, *The Trevelyon Miscellany* (1608)

Guildhall Library, London

15201/2, *Court Minutes of the Vintners' Company*

34010/4, *Worshipful Company of Merchant Taylors, Court Minute Book*

34048/8, *Worshipful Company of Merchant Taylors, Master and Wardens' Account Book*

Heinz Archive and Library, National Portrait Gallery, London

'*Catalogue of the Painting and Portraits at Hornby Castle the Seat of the Duke of Leeds, 1868*' (unpublished transcription of the MS catalogue at Hornby Castle) in 'Notes on Collections: Hornby Castle, Yorkshire'

Laing, Alastair, 'Knole: English, late 16th Century: the sets of portraits of Famous Men in the Brown Gallery' (unpublished notes, 1996) in 'Notes on Collections: Knole'

Laing, Alastair, 'Knole: A Series of Historical Portraits' (unpublished notes, 1998) in 'Notes on Collections: Knole'

'Notes on Collections: Hornby Castle, Yorkshire'

'Notes on Collections: Ingatestone, Essex'

'Notes on Collections: Knole, Kent'

'Notes on Collections: The Northumberland Collection'

NPG7/3/1/33, Scharf, Sir George, 1876 diary

Kent History and Library Centre, Maidstone

U269/E 79/2, *An Inventory of the Goo[ds of the] Right Honorable the Earl of Dorset the 14.th day of October 1706*

U269, *An Inventory of Goods at Knole, Taken in Nov.r 1730* location unknown (transcription at Scotney Castle, Kent)

U269/E4, *Furnishings and pictures at Knole* (1765)

U269/E5, *Furnishings and pictures at Knole* (1799)

U269/O10/1, *Parliamentary Inventory of Knole* (1645)

U269/O69/1, *Inventory of Furnishings, Plate etc at Hampton Court, Kensington, Windsor and Whithall, of goods delived to the Lord Chamberlain* (1689-97)

Longleat House, Wiltshire

Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 25 (1704)

Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 53, *Inventory of Longleat, 1596*

Longleat House, Thynne Papers MS 78, fol. 132^v, *Inventory of Longleat House* (26 February 1718)

National Archives, London

LR 2/115, fols 1-66, *Inventory of Thomas Howard, 3rd Duke of Norfolk, Kenninghall, Norfolk* (1546)

SP 1/21, fol. 67, *Inventory of the goods and chattels of Thomas lord Darcy, made 10 Hen. VIII* (1520)

SP 12/81, fols. 67-82, *Inventory of Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, Kenninghall, Norfolk* (1571)

SP 12/266, fol. 153, *Voluntary confession of Wm. Love. master of a fly-boat* (20 April 1598)

SP 16/531, fol. 194, *Names of Lieutenants of ye Tower of London in ye Severall Reignes of these kings and Queens following*, compiled under Charles I

SP 77/10, fol. 352, *Letter from William Trumbull to Sir Robert Carr* (5 November 1613)

National Art Library, Victoria & Albert Museum, London

L 1783/11A, *A true and perfect inventory of all the Houshold Goods and Furniture at Kiveton in the County of York belonging to the Right Hon.^{ble} The Marquess of Carmarthen* (1727)

Staffordshire Record Office, Stafford

D1287/3/1, *John Bridgeman, Account Book* (1608/9-39)

University College, London

MS Ogden 24, *Trevelyon Miscellany*

York City Archives, York

ACC M31, *Deeds and Estate Papers of the Robinson family*

Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Leeds

DD5/12/4, *Inventory and Valuation of Household Goods and Furniture Remaining at Hornby Castle after the Dowager Duchess of Leeds had made choice of such things as her Grace required* (1838)

Calendared Sources

Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 4: 1561-1562, ed. by Joseph Stevenson (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1866) [via British History Online]

Calendar of State Papers Foreign, Elizabeth, Volume 11: 1575-1577, ed. by Allan James Crosby (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1880) [via British History Online]

Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 7: 1558-1580, ed. by Rawdon Brown and G. Cavendish Bentinck (London: Longman, Green, Longman & Roberts, 1890) [via British History Online]

Sales Catalogues

Christie's, London, *A Catalogue of all the Elegant and Rich Houshold Furniture, the Capital Library of well-chosen Books, Linen, China, Pictures, Prints and Drawings [...] of the Late William Sheldon, Esq; dec. At his Seat, called Weston, near Long Compton, in the County of Warwick*, (London: Christie & Ansell, 1781)

Rodd, H., *A Catalogue of Authentic Portraits: Painted in oil, on pannel and canvas, miniatures, marble busts, &c. ... the whole of which are now offered for sale at the prices affixed / by H. Rodd* (London: printed by J. Compton, Middle Street, Cloth Fair, 1824)

Sotheby's, London, 'The Property of the late Earl of Ellenborough removed from Southam Delabere, Gloucestershire' in *Catalogue of Highly Important Paintings by Old Masters* (11 June 1947)